Authority and Leadership in Early Islam:

A Historiographical Study of the Caliphate of Mu□□wiya b. Ab□ Sufy□n

Submitted by Ammar Nakhjavani to the University of Exeter
as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Arabic and Islamic Philosophy
in February 2011

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

AMMAR NAKHJAVANI

Signature: ……..

BRITISH LIBRARY

IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

THIS DIGITIAL COPY IS A PRELIMINARY SUPPLIED BY THE UNIVERSITY

IT CONTAINS CORRUPTED ARABIC CHARACTERS AND SYMBOLS WHICH HAVE NOT TRANSPOSED

A CORRECTED COPY MAY BECOME AVAILABLE IN THE FUTURE

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Sajjad Rizvi. It has been an honour to be his student. He has helped me tremendously and has given unstintingly with his time and ideas. Whenever I have needed his advice and knowledge, he has always co-operated – for which I will be forever grateful. Secondly, I would also like to thank Professor C. E. Bosworth for his supervision of my thesis and the wealth of advice with which he provided me, not only at the university, but from his home as well. Thirdly, I would like to thank the staff at the University of Exeter Library for their support and guidance during my period of study. Fourthly, I would like to thank my editor Kawther Rahmani for all her hard work and dedication in editing and proofreading my manuscript. Given the nature and complexity of the work, and due to various time constraints, I take full responsibility for any mistake within the manuscript. Finally, I would like to thank my family, whose patience in this period has proved to be their greatest virtue.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements……..2
List of Abbreviations……4
Abstract……..……..5
Introduction……..……6
Chapter 1: Source Critical Methodology……...……..31
Chapter 2: Sources……..68
Chapter 3: Leadership and Authority in Classical Islam……108
Chapter 4: The Biography of Mu□□wiya As Depicted in Classical and Modern Literature……..149
Chapter 5: *□ilm* ……191
Chapter 6: *Shuj□□a* ……. 219
Chapter 7: *□Ilm* ……. 259
Conclusion……290

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MES *British Journal of Middle East Studies*

BMGS *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*

BSOAS *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*

CH *Church History*

DI *Der Islam*

DWI *Die Welt des Islams*

IAO *Israel Oriental Studies*

IJMES *International Journal of Middle East Studies*

ILS *Islamic Law and Society*

JAL *Journal of Arabic Literature*

JAOS *Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JESHO *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient*

JIS *Journal of Islamic Studies*

JNES *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

JQ *Jerusalem Quarterly*

JR *The Journal of Religion*

JRAS *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*

JSAI *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*

JSS *Journal of Semitic Studies*

SI *Studia Islamica*

SMJR *Studies in Muslim-Jewish Relations*

Abstract

This study seeks to engage in a historiographical study of the caliphate of Mu□□wiya b. Ab□ Sufy□n in light of the construction of the concept of leadership in early Islam. In contrast to previous works of scholarship, our purpose is not only to understand the approach and objectives of early Muslim historians in their depiction of Mu□□wiya's period of rule, but to extend the analysis to examining his leadership using *adab*, jurisprudential and theological literature from the 3rd to 6th century AH, using the inter-textual approach. The conditions for leadership were examined in addition to the attributes that were expected of the leader of the nascent Islamic community. We looked at different periods and episodes during the leadership of Mu□□wiya which would allow us to shed light on the position and importance of these attributes. Three conditions for leadership were examined, namely *□ilm*, *□ilm* and *shuj□□a*. After examining each of these attributes, we have found the conclusion regarding the depiction of Mu□□wiya has been similar, revealing a great disparity between what was expected of the leader of the Islamic polity and what was seen in Mu□□wiya's period of rule. Herein lies what could be seen as the first substantial finding of this work. Our second substantial finding is to reject the

theory that any pro-ʿAlid genre of literature indicates an Imāmī bias. Thirdly, the inter-textual approach allows us to gain a more thorough understanding of Muʿāwiya's caliphate and is a method of source criticism that can be used in examining the biographies of many figures throughout Islamic history.

Introduction

This study is a historiographical examination of the caliphate of Muʿāwiya b. Abū Sufyān, focusing on the depiction of his leadership in early classical Muslim literatures. By examining a range of literary sources from the 3rd to the 6th centuries AH/9th to the 12th centuries CE, it offers a methodological model for the analysis of sacred history in classical Islam. Rather than simply focusing on the leadership of Muʿāwiya b. Abū Sufyān through historical sources, this study will analyse different genres of literature which would help to appreciate the nature of leadership in the formative period of Islamic history. The method which will be adopted is the 'inter-textual approach'.[1] The main thesis of this study is that the discourse based on the

[1] The method adopted will be the inter-textual approach as defined in the works of Julia Kristeva. See Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

qualities and attributes of the leader of the Muslim community is the earliest discourse in Islamic society. In these discourses, the main themes emerge which discuss the importance of *ʿilm* (knowledge) and *shujāʿa* (courage). However, there is little mention of *ḥilm* (self-control), an attribute often associated with Muʿāwiya in the historical and polemical contemporary sources. A key function of this study will be to use the inter-textual approach to establish the criteria for leadership in various genres of literature in the classical period, and its relation to the caliphate of Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān.

Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān

According to traditional Muslim sources, Muʿāwiya was born in Mecca five years before the open proclamation of the religion of Islam.[2] His father was Ṣakhr b. Ḥarb b. Umayyah b. ʿAbd Shams b. ʿAbd Manāf, who was known as Abū Sufyān and his mother was Hind bt. ʿUtbah b. Rabīʿah b. ʿAbd Shams b. ʿAbd Manāf.[3] Abū Sufyān had two sons, Yazīd and Muʿāwiya, and a daughter named Umm Ḥabībah. Muʿāwiya ruled the nascent Muslim community from 41-60/661-680. Historians see Muʿāwiya as either the first or the second of the Umayyad caliphs as ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān ruled before him from 23-35/644-656.[4] ʿUthmān is viewed as being amongst the

[2] Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Iṣābah fī tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* (Cairo: Būlāq, 1328/1910), vol. 3, 433.
[3] On Abū Sufyān, see Abū ʿAmr Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāṭ, *al-Ṭabaqāt: riwāyat Abī ʿImrān Mūsā al-Tustarī*, ed. Akram Ḍiyāʾ al-ʿUmarī (Baghdad: Maṭbaʿat al-ʿĀnī, 1967), 297; ʿAbdullāh b. Muslim Ibn Qutayba, *Kitāb al-maʿārif*, ed. Tharwat ʿUkāshah (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Dār al-Kutub, 1960), 344; ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn al-Masʿūdī, *al-Tanbīh wa-l-ishrāf* (Leiden, 1894, rpt., Beirut: Maktabat al-Khayyāṭ, 1965); on Hind, see Ibn Khayyāṭ, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, 298.
[4] Asma Afsaruddin, *The First Muslims: History and Memory* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2008), 47-50, discusses the notion of ʿUthmān as being amongst the rightly guided caliphs. Cf. M. A. Shaban, *Islamic History: A New*

rightly guided caliphs, an honour notably given to only one other Umayyad, ʿUmar II.[5] Muʿāwiya, however, is regarded as the founder of the caliphate of the Umayyad dynasty.[6] The Sufyanid dynasty refers solely to Muʿāwiya and his lineage, which came to an end with the death of his grandson Muʿāwiya II in 64/683, thus marking the beginning of the Marwānid dynasty.

There is a difference of opinion on the dating of Muʿāwiya's conversion to Islam.[7] A conversion preceding the conquest of Mecca would be more favourable in light of later claims for the caliphate, as he would not be categorized as being one of the freed ones, known as the *ṭulaqāʾ*. One narration discusses his conversion as taking place before the occupation of Mecca. The narration discusses the fact that he accepted Islam at the Treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah.[8] Another narration, however, indicates a conversion to Islam in the year 8 AH, hence counting him amongst

---

Interpretation A.D. 600-750 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), vol. 1, 63.

[5] Gerald R. Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam* (London: Routledge, 2000), 18. It is not very clear when the term *al-khulafāʾ al-rāshidūn* was crystallised. Afsaruddin comments on page 55 of *The First Muslims* that 'the concept began to crystallize at some point during the Umayyad period when, against the backdrop of what appeared to be a deliberate reversion to pre-Islamic values, nostalgia for the age of the Prophet and his companions must have become pronounced. Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 767) and Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal (d. 855) are credited with being the earliest scholars to recognise the chronological order of the four *rāshidūn* caliphs and to have imparted a certain degree of theological significance to this order'. There is a difference of opinion as to whether was ʿAlī was initially excluded from the list of caliphs. See Wilferd Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 173. This seems to have changed by the late eighth century. See W. Montgomery Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973), 77.

[6] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam*, 1.

[7] ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh Madīnat Dimashq*, ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū Saʿīd ʿUmar b. Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995-1998), vol. 61, 57. See also Aḥmed b. Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979), vol. 4, 13, who discusses a different though not exact date and indicates that it was earlier than the conquest of Mecca.

[8] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣābah,* vol. 3, 433; see also Isaac Hasson, 'La conversion de Muʿāwiya ibn Abū Sufyān', *JSAI*, 22 (1998), 219.

the freedmen in Mecca.[9] After his conversion, Mu□□wiya was given one hundred camels and forty ounces of gold from the booty of the Battle of □unayn, for he was one of those whose hearts had been reconciled. [10] Mu□□wiya was employed by the Prophet as a secretary, or *k□tib*.[11] Amongst his duties was to ensure messages were written to chiefs of different Arab tribes.[12]

Mu□□wiya served the state during the rule of the first three caliphs. First, he acted as lieutenant of the army that conquered Syria during the reign of Ab□ Bakr. Then, when Kh□lid b. Sa□□d b. al-□□ had been defeated and killed by the Byzantines in the Battle of Marj al-Suffar in the year 13/633, Mu□□wiya was head of the 3, 000 tribesmen that were part of the expedition.[13] Furthermore, during the reign of □Umar,[14] he fought and defeated the Byzantines in the Battle of al-Yarm□k in 15/635 and would then continue under □Uthm□n as a military governor.[15]

The political divisions of the period between 656 and 661 acquired significance in regards to the discussions of Mu□□wiya's authority and leadership for later Muslims.[16] These events shaped the identities, as well as the political thoughts, of the Muslim communities.[17] Irreconcilable factions within the

---

[9] Ab□ Ja□far Muḥammad b. Jarīr b.Yazīd al-□abar□, *Ta□r□kh al-Rusul wal-mul□k,* ed. M.J. de Goeje, et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1881), vol. 1, 1642-3.
[10] Ism□□□l b. □Umar Ibn Kath□r, *al-Bid□yah wa al-Nih□yah* (Beirut: Maktabah al-Ma□□rif, 1966), vol. 8, 117.
[11] Izz al-D□n Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil fi al-ta□r□kh*, ed. C.J. Tornberg (Leiden: Brill, 1868-70), vol. 2, 313; Afsaruddin, *The First Muslims*, 81.
[12] Ibn □ajar, *al-I□abah*, vol. 3, 434.
[13] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 2090-1.
[14] Suliman Bashear, "The Title F□r□q and its Association with □Umar I", *SI*, 72 (1990), 47-70.
[15] A□med b. Ya□y□ al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, ed. M. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1865), 135-6. See also R. B. Serjeant, "The Caliph □Umar's Letters to Ab□ Mus□ and Mu□□wiya", *SS*, 24 (1984), 65-79.
[16] Martin Hinds, "The Murder of the Caliph □Uthm□n", *IJMES*, 3 (1972), 450-69.
[17] Moshe Sharon, "Notes on the Question of Legitimacy of Government in Islam", *IAO*, 10 (1980), 116-23.

community were to be explained in light of the civil wars after the murder of ʿUthmān.[18] Tensions were clearly prevalent within the new Muslim community.[19] Old rivalries between the Meccans and Medinans, as well as inter-tribal conflicts, were revived. The newly created Islamic theocracy was full of dissensions.[20] Abū Bakr and ʿUmar were seen to have upheld a *modus vivendi*[21] with their recognition of the religious and political aspects of leading the Islamic state.[22] However, with the emergence of ʿUthmān and the Umayyads, dissatisfaction once again resurfaced.[23] Muʿāwiya's leadership is central to this period and its main events as we shall see.[24]

It is a period which academics have called 'Islamic origins'.[25] The history of Islamic origins is mainly taken from Islamic tradition itself. There are extensive sources for this - that fact is not under question.[26] Yet the documentary value of such sources is under intense scrutiny and this in many cases reduces the confidence of scholars when seeking to build a traditional picture of Islamic origins.[27] This is not to deny that there are

---

[18] Patricia Crone, *God's Rule: Government in Islam* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 23.
[19] Hinds, "The Murder of the Caliph ʿUthmān".
[20] Hawting, "The Significance of the Slogan *La ḥukma illa Lillah* and the References to the *ḥudūd* in the Traditions about the *Fitna* and the Murder of ʿUthmān", *BSOAS,* 41 (1978), 453-463.
[21] E. Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1964), Introduction. However, Madelung questions the legitimacy of their authority in light of the events at Saqīfat Banī Sāʿidah - see Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 28.
[22] W. Montgomery Watt, "God's Caliph: Qurʾānic Interpretations and Umayyad Claims", *Iran and Islam*, ed. C.E. Bosworth (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971).
[23] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 113. See also Sayyid Quṭb, *Social Justice in Islam,* tr. John Hardie (New York: Octagon Books, 1970), 183.
[24] Moshe Sharon, "The Umayyads as Ahl al-Bayt", *JSAI*, 14 (1992), 115-52.
[25] Fred Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginning of Islamic Historical Writing* (Princeton: The Darwin Press, Inc: 1998), 1.
[26] Martin Hinds, "The Siffin Arbitration Agreement", *JSS,* 17 (1972), 92-129.
[27] Sebastian P. Brock, "Syriac Sources for Seventh Century History", *BMGS*, 2 (1976).

sources which, although outside of the Islamic tradition, were contemporary with the spread of Islam.[28] These have been viewed as being more reliable than the Islamic sources (by sceptics at least), as they were produced without any type of theological or political stance underpinning the way history is portrayed.[29] These sources are of the utmost importance, though at times they may not provide conclusive or even helpful results in relation to certain parts of history.[30] Particular detail shall be paid in our study to the conditions for leadership, which are listed in such sources, in order to examine the reign of Mu□□wiya.[31] 'The Maronite Chronicle', compiled by an anonymous Maronite Christian, recorded Mu□□wiya's succession as caliph. This chronicle was compiled between 664 and 727 and is seen as a near contemporaneous source.[32] This is the view adopted by Marsham when he states:

> The two Syriac accounts of Mu□□wiya's succession in Syria are not only contemporaneous evidence for early Umayyad succession ritual than anything in the extant Arabic-Islamic material but are also more detailed in many respects. We can be reasonably confident that they are near contemporaneous, even perhaps eyewitness

---

[28] Michael Lecker, "The Estates of □Amr b. al-□□ in Palestine: Notes on a New Negev Arabic Inscription", *BSOAS*, 52 (1989), 24-37.
[29] Walter Kaegi, "Initial Byzantine Reactions to the Arab Conquests", *CH,* 38 (1969), 139-49; R. Hoyland, "Sebeos, the Jews and the Rise of Islam", *SMJR,* 2 (1996), 89-102.
[30] Fred Donner, *The Early Islamic Conquests* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 142-146.
[31] Also, to understand the later Umayyad caliphs, see Michael Bates, "The □Arab-Byzantine Bronze Coinage of Syria: An Innovation by □Abd al-M□lik", *A Colloquium in Memory of George Carpenter Miles* (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1976). See also Averil Cameron, "Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium", in M. Mullet and R. Scott (eds.), *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1981).
[32] A. Palmer, S. Brock, and R. Hoyland, *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1993), 29.

accounts, copied by the compiler of the chronicle.[33]

The narratives indicate a ceremony representing a shift from the caliphate to kingship. Mu□□wiya's reign as leader marks that shift from caliphate to kingship in light of the conditions of leadership as stipulated in the sources.

Leadership and its Conditions

Both medieval and modern scholars are in agreement that the fundamental divide in Islam concerns the crucial issue of leadership of the Islamic polity and the merits of the person who undertakes leadership.[34] These differences emerge in 11/632 when the Prophet Muhammad died. A group known as the *sh□□at □Al□* opposed the election of Ab□ Bakr to the caliphate, favouring the Prophet's son-in-law and paternal cousin, □Al□ b. Ab□ □□lib.[35] Sunn□ and Sh□□□ alike were divided on who possessed legitimate authority to occupy the place of the Prophet as the head of the Islamic community.[36] While the issue may have been settled in the minds of the followers, each school proposed a framework to examine the succession. They would both advocate the candidacy of their respected figure for the caliphate. By the 2nd/8th century, the conditions for leadership and criteria such as

---

[33] Andrew Marsham, *Rituals of Islamic Monarchy, Accession and Succession in the First Muslim Empire* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 87-88.
[34] Ab□ al-□asan □Al□ b. Ism□□□l al-Ash□ar□, *Maq□l□t al-Isl□miyy□n,* ed. Hellmut Ritter (Istanbul, 1928), 15.
[35] Hossein Modarressi, *Crisis and Consolidation in the Formative Period of Sh□□ite Islam: Ab□ Ja□far ibn Qiba al-R□z□ and His Contribution to Im□mite Sh□'ite Thought* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1993), Part One, 1-105. References to the Sh□□a are primarily to the Im□m□yya, unless otherwise stated.
[4] Hamid Dabashi, *Authority in Islam: From the Rise of Muhammad to the Establishment of the Umayyads*, 2nd edition (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1992), Asma Afsaruddin, *Excellence and Precedence: Medieval Discourse on Legitimate Leadership* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), Introduction. See also Marshall Hodgson, "How Did the Early Sh□□a become Sectarian", *JAOS*, 75 (1955), 1-13.

moral excellences and precedence in rendering services to Islam were being discussed.[37] By the mid to the latter part of the 3rd/9th century, there had been a crystallizing of Sunnī and Shīʿī views on this subject.[38] This crystallization would occur in an environment where each party would not only propose their argument but would also refute that of the opposition.[39]

It is therefore necessary when examining the early conceptions of leadership in Sunnī-Shīʿī political thought to analyse the key polemic or dialogic issues that each side chose to emphasise in their discussions. Watt states:

> Thus the dispute whether Abū Bakr or ʿAlī succeeded the Prophet were closely bound up with the dispute whether the Qurʾān and the Traditions, in their application to the life of the community, were to be interpreted by the generally accepted methods of the scholars are by the bare decision of the Imām; and this was a central question in the politics of the ninth century.[40]

At the same time, there is a need to specify the commonalities between the two groups. The partisans of both groups would emphasize that the Muslim community was in need of guidance by a leader, a man who had the necessary attributes to guide, and one whose authority would be deemed as legitimate through a distinct process of legitimization. Certain characteristics would be seen

---

[5] Afsaruddin, *Excellence and Precedence*, 2.
[6] Arzina Lalani, *Early Shīʿī Thought: The Teachings of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir* (London: I.B. Tauris and the Institute of Ismāʿīlī Studies, 2004). See also Wilferd Madelung, "Early Sunnī Doctrine Concerning Faith as Reflected in the Kitāb al-Īmān of Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām" (d. 224/839), *SI,* 32 (1970), 233-54.
[7] Asma Afsaruddin, "In Praise of the Caliphs: Recreating History from the *Manāqib* Literature", *IJMES,* 31 (1999), 329-50.
[8] Patricia Crone, *God's Rule*; See Etan Kohlberg, "From Imāmiyya to Ithnā-Asharīyya'', *BSOAS*, 39 (1976), 521-34 and "Evolution of the Shīʿa'', *JQ,* 27 (1983), 109-26.
[40] Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, 167.

as indicating a leader's excellence. This discussion concerning merits and excellences would pave the way for the development of key theological positions in relation to authority and leadership on both sides. These key theological, historical, belles-lettres and jurisprudential discourses will be examined with their respective opinions of Mu□□wiya's rule.

Theological and historical works discuss the importance of *shuj□□a* as a condition for leadership.[41] The basis of their argument was that the Qur□an emphasises on many occasions God's respect for the courageous. *Shuj□□a* is highly praised in the Qur□an. Verses would continuously revere the early Muslims who were willing to sacrifice all they had on the battlefield. For example, *S□rat al-□ad□d* (Iron), 57:10, states:[42]

> And what cause have ye why ye should not spend in the cause of Allah? - For to Allah belongs the heritage of the heavens and the earth. Not equal among you are those who spent (freely) and fought, before the Victory, (with those who did so later). Those are higher in rank than those who spent (freely) and fought afterwards. But to all has Allah promised a goodly (reward). And Allah is well acquainted with all that ye do.

The central issue of *□ilm* (knowledge) also emerges in early

---

[41] Ab□ Ya□qūb Isḥ□q b. Aḥmad al-Sijist□n□, *Kit□b al-Iftikh□r,* ed. with notes and comments by Ismail K. Poonawala (Beirut: D□r al-Gharb al-Isl□m□, 2000), 160; "Urjuza", tr. in Ismail K. Poonawala, *Al-Qa□□ al-Num□n and his Urjuza on the Im□mate* (University of California, Los Angeles, Ph.d. dissertation, 1970), 27; Ab□ Abdull□h Mu□ammad b. Mu□ammad al-Muf□d, *Kit□b al-Irsh□d*, tr. I.K.A. Howard (London: The Muhammadi Trust, 1981), 3; Ab□ al-□asan □Al□ b. Ism□□□l al-Ash□ar□, *Kit□b al-Luma'*, text and translation in R.J. McCarthy, *The Theology of al-Ash□ar□* (Beirut: 1953), 115; Ab□ Is□□q al-Sh□r□z□, *al-Ish□rah il□ madhhab Ahl al-□aqq* (al-Q□hirah: Markaz al-S□rah wa al-Sunnah, 1999), 176; □Abd al-□Aẓ□m al-D□b, *Im□m al-□□ramayn* (Kuwait: D□r al-Qalam, 1981), 145.

[42] *The Qur□□n*, tr. □Abdull□h Yūsuf □Al□ (New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, Inc., 2007). Note: all quotations from the Qur□□n are from the Yūsuf □Al□ translation.

discussions concerning leadership. To possess both religious and general knowledge became part of the criteria for righteous and legitimate leadership. The Qur□□n emphasises the difference between the people who had knowledge and were seen to be righteous in contrast to the ignorant who as result would be known as wrong-doers.[43] The righteous with knowledge would eventually inherit the earth and the ruler of such a group would need to be endowed with comprehension of such knowledge, if not at the very least have access to it. Traditional Sunn□ sources would view the leader as both law-maker and law-enforcer, a leader would have knowledge of worldly affairs and religious law. They would rule by observing the precedent set by the Prophet. If this was not available, they would resort to personal interpretation of the Qur□□n and *□ad□th*. In Sunn□ Islam, the scholars, regarded as being the interpreters of the *shar□□ah*, would be defined as the Im□ms of the community.[44]

When examining the theological sources of the 3rd to the 6th century, it is evident that the caliph must be a person of *□ilm*. The Mu□tazila were of the opinion that the caliph helps guide the believers in their obligations and explains to them how they are to be followed, an opinion shared by al-J□□i□ in the world of *adab*, who believed in a triumvirate of men of *□ilm*: the Prophets, the Messengers and the Im□ms.[45] This opinion is also posited in the works of Ibn al-B□qill□n□, who amongst the duties of the Im□m, cites the importance of his role as one who ensures that *shar□□ah* is implemented and the punishments are explained

[43] See, for example, 2:120, 145; 30:29; 34:6.
[44] Wad□d al-Q□□□, "The Religious Foundation of Late Umayyad Ideology and Practice'', *Saber Religioso y Poder Politico en el Islam: Actas del Simposio Internacional,* Granada, 15-18 Octubre 1991 (Madrid, 1994), 250.
[45] □Abd al-Jabb□r b. Aḥmad al-Asad□b□d□, *al-Mughn□* (Cairo: al-Mu'assasa al-Mi□r□yya al-□□mma lil-ta'l□f wal-anb□' wal-nashr, 1961-5), vol. 20, Part 1, 17; Pellet, 64, tr. Sandubi, *Rasa'il*, Istihqaq, 241-8.

and al-Ash□ar□ saw the Im□m as the most excellent of the community.[46] Furthermore, al-M□ward□ viewed the caliph as a figure who:

> prevents them from committing injustices towards each other, and who arbitrates between them in the events of disputes and quarrels, and because without a leader men live in anarchy and lack of constraint in the manner of savages left to themselves.[47]

Al-Juwayn□ defined the caliph as one who should be the interpreter of Islamic law and a *muft□* in character, one who should be followed and not a follower.[48] Therefore, *□ilm* in these sources is seen as a condition for leadership, to disseminate knowledge of both religious and secular affairs in the Islamic state. In contrast, the Im□m□s and the Ism□□□l□s[49] view *□ilm* as necessary to ensure the guidance of the community of believers in all matters pertaining to one's life, both public and private.

Furthermore, the Qur□□n, in *S□rat al-N□r* (Light), 24:55, combines righteousness with political authority on the earth:

> Allah has promised, to those among you who believe and work righteous deeds, that He will, of a surety, grant them in the

---

[46] Ab□ Bakr Mu□ammad b. al-□ayyib al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tamh□d fi al-Radd □al□ al-mul□idah al-mu□a□□alah wa al-r□fi□ah wa-l-Khaw□rij wa-l-Mu□tazilah* (al-Q□hirah: D□r al-Fikr al-Isl□m□, 1947), 185-6; al-Ash□ar□, *Maq□l□t al-Islam□yy□n*, 151.

[47] Ab□ al-□asan □Al□ b. Mu□ammad b. □ab□b al-M□ward□, *al-A□k□m al-Sul□□n□yyah* (Egypt, 1966), 5.

[48] □Abd al-Malik b. □Abd All□h b. Yūsuf al-Juwayn□, *Ghiy□th al-Um□m fi al-Tiy□th al-□ulam*, ed. A. D□b (Qatar, 1400/1979), 91; see also Ira M. Lapidus, *A History of Islamic Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 84-90.

[49] Etan Kohlberg, "Im□m and Community in the Pre-Ghayba Period", in *Authority and Political Culture in Sh□□ism*, ed. Sa□□d Am□r Arjomand (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988), 25; al-Sijistan□, *Kit□b al-Iftikh□r*, 159; and "Urujuza", tr. in Poonawala, *Al-Qa□□ al-Num□n*, 27.

> land, inheritance (of power), as He granted it to those before them; that He will establish in authority their religion - the one which He has chosen for them; and that He will change (their state), after the fear in which they (lived), to one of security and peace: 'They will worship Me (alone) and not associate aught with Me'. If any do reject Faith after this, they are rebellious and wicked.[50]

Righteous actions are equated with inheritance of the earth on other occasions including *sūrah* 7:69 and *sūrah* 17:38.[51] The importance of such verses is that qualities such as *ʿilm* and *ʿilm* would be invoked and used to establish the claims of a particular candidate for authority by belle-lettrists, theologians and historians of the 3rd/6th century.[52]

The 3rd to 6th centuries saw discussions in different genres concerning the role and qualifications required by the leader of the community of believers.[53] Theological, *adab*, jurisprudential and historical sources seek to depict the definition of authority in the formative period of Islamic thought.[54] The main themes of *ʿilm* and *shujāʿa* emerge within these different literatures and will be examined in order to shed light on the depiction of Muʿāwiyah's leadership in Muslim historiography. *ʿilm,* however, an attribute Muʿāwiya is revered for, is not

[50] *The Qurʾān*.
[51] Wadād al-Qāḍī, "The Term 'Khalīfa' in Early Exegetical Literature", *DWI,* 28 (1988), 392-411. Al-Qāḍī discusses the fact that throughout the Umayyad period of rule, the Umayyads would view *khalīfa* and *khulīfa* as references to humans in general, who would one day rule the earth.
[52] See, for example, the celebrated belle-lettrist Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ, *Risālat al-ʿUthmānīyya,* ed. A.S.M. Harun (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1955).
[53] See also R. Gleave, "Between ḥadīth and Fiqh: Early Imāmī Collections of Akhbār", *ILS*, 8, 3 (2001), 350-382.
[54] Hossein Modarressi, *Tradition and Survival: A Bibliographical Survey of Early Shīʿite Literature* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2003), 1. See also M. Morony, trans., *History of Ṭabarī: Between Civil Wars: The Caliphate of Muʿāwiyah*, vol. 18 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987).

discussed in the criteria for leadership in this period. This study will seek to examine the variant position of these different genres of Islamic literature and the way they help examine and depict Mu□□wiya's leadership.

Islamic Sources and the Depiction of Mu□□wiya

A survey of the sources that discuss Mu□□wiya's leadership is therefore vital. Historical, theological, jurisprudential, *adab* and jurisprudence literature form the basis of the narratives relating to the period in and around the *fitnah* and provide adequate evidence that the theory of the schools can be rejected and that through source criticism, the similarities and contradictions in the narratives display no clear political or ideological motive in compilation. Furthermore, the belief that the issue of the legitimacy of the Caliph, his authority and the scope of this authority arose after the civil wars is also open to criticism. The collections of historical narrative and theological treatise discuss the issue of leadership becoming an issue just days after Mu□ammad had died, at Saq□fah, in a problem that arose between Ab□ Bakr and □Al□. Moreover, the excellence and precedence material in *adab* literature discuss the merits of the candidates to be the first of the caliphs, and not simply the fourth, as most would portray. Moreover, these sources help us depict a historiographical understanding of Mu□□wiya's leadership.

In their analysis of Mu□□wiya, scholars fall into two categories. One group view Mu□□wiya as a despot, centralizing his rule whereas others see him as decentralizing his leadership whenever possible. When reading the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*

articles, the difference is very clear. Lammens[55] argued that Mu□□wiya tried to centralize power throughout his reign. This same view is shared by Hodgson,[56] although Hodgson does at times indicate that Mu□□wiya attempted to decentralize government control. Ma□mood Ibr□h□m, the author of *The Social and Economic Background of the Umayyad Caliphate: The Role of Mu□□wiya ibn Ab□ Sufy□n*, has a book entitled *Merchant Capital and Islam,*[57] where he clearly portrays Mu□□wiya as a centralizer. Furthermore, recent works in Arabic have also portrayed this attitude, including □Abd al-□al□m □Uways' *Ban□ Umayyah bayn al-suq□t wa al-inti□□r; dir□sah □awl suq□□ Ban□ Umayyah f□ al-mashriq*[58] and Nabil □Aq□l's *Dirasat fi al-□a□r al-umaw□*.[59]

Martin Hinds, however, is at the forefront of a second group, who view the provinces as being somewhat autonomous and Mu□□wiya's government as being decentralized.[60] Hinds says that the heart of the dispute between □Al□ and Mu□□wiya was the fact that the Syrians had always wanted autonomy. Keshk portrays this in an interesting narration between □Al□'s messenger to Mu□□wiya, Jar□r b. □Abd All□h al-Bajal□, and Mu□□wiya's supporter, namely Shurahbil b. al-□im□. Shurahbil makes it clear that □Al□'s aims are to 'mix Syria with al-Iraq' to which Jar□r replies that a 'mix of righteousness is better than a separation built on falsehood'.[61] This view is similar to that portrayed by

---

[55] Henri Lammens, "Mu□□wiya", *Encylopaedia of Islam,* 2nd edition (Leiden: Brill, 1954-66) vol. 3, 617-621, esp. 619-620.
[56] Marshall S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).
[57] (Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1990), 126-189.
[58] (Cairo: D□r al-Sahwa, 1987).
[59] (4th edition, Damascus: University of Damascus Press, 1991-92).
[60] Martin Hinds, 'Mu□□wiya I', *Encylopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, vol. 7, 263-268, esp. 266-7.
[61] Khaled Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya in the Early Islamic Sources* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2002), 115.

M. A. Shaban in *Islamic History : A New Interpretation I,*[62] Hugh Kennedy in *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphate,*[63] and Gerald R. Hawting in *The First Dynasty of Islam*[64] as well as ʿAbd al-Munʿim Khafājī and ʿAbd al-Azīz Sharaf in *Maʿārik fīʾilah fi al-tārikh al-Islāmī*, 41-132 AH.[65]

Humphreys' book, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān: From Arabia to Empire* clearly falls within a tendency, or even school of historians, wishing to revive interest in the Umayyads and defend them against the bias of mainstream Muslim historiography.[66] Humphreys begins by making clear that any study on Muʿāwiya as an example is difficult for he is 'a hard man to pin down' but at the same time a 'remarkable man'.[67] Moreover, we find the characteristic of *ʿilm* applied to Muʿāwiya:

> He was famed for his political acumen, embodied in the quality of *ʿilm*, a word best understood as forbearance in the face of provocation. He consulted wisely and listened closely but did not show his hand. He could be eloquent but relied on wit and irony rather than the moving rhetoric ascribed to his rival ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭalib. Neither his friends nor his enemies ever quite knew what he was thinking until it was too late to do anything about it.[68]

While stressing the lack of sympathy within Shīʿī and Khārijite circles, Humphreys does admit that Muʿāwiya does not necessarily

---

[62] M.A. Shaban, *Islamic History: A New Interpretation I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 79-81.
[63] Hugh Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphate: The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century* (London: Longman, 1986), 78-9.
[64] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam.*
[65] (Cairo: Dār al-Miṣrīyya al-Lubnānīyya, 1989).
[66] R.S. Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān: From Arabia to Empire* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2006).
[67] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, ix.
[68] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, 3.

fall within the definition of the more traditional religious circles:

> The real problem is that he did not fit neatly into the moral categories which later Muslims decided to evaluate a person's religious standing - indeed, he subverted them, and so they could never quite decide what to make of him.[69]

He speaks of 'Arabic sources, dominated by Iraqi and pro-ʿAlid perspectives'.[70] ʿAlī is portrayed here as never intending to find the killers of ʿUthmān. But at the same time, he ironically belittles Muʿāwiya's approach to events. First is the clear lack of help he offers his cousin in his time of need. Intrigue overshadows much of Muʿāwiya's intention for the position of caliph, like that of his partner ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, 'a man not above cynical opportunism'.[71]

Humphreys introduces certain members of the caliph's government - people whose personal conduct had 'often been scandalous',[72] like al-Mughīrah and the hapless Zīyād, son of his father, named because of his mysterious, adulterous birth. 'To win the reluctant Zīyād to his cause, Muʿāwiya had the idea of proclaiming that he was the son of his own father Abū Sufyān',[73] an act of un-Islamic proportions. This Zīyād is highly praised by Humphreys, especially in a comical narration of his striking an innocent bedouin's head![74] Humphreys does, however, admit that Muʿāwiya 'lacked and almost certainly never desired, the religious charisma of Muḥammad but in his methods of using

---

[69] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, 3.
[70] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, 79.
[71] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, 81.
[72] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, 86.
[73] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, 89.
[74] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyān*, 92.

political means for political ends, he is perhaps no different'.[75]

Moreover, the depiction of Mu□□wiya, according to Keshk, very much depends on the period in which the accounts have taken place and who the narrators of the respective events are. His work includes an analysis of some diametrically opposed depictions, within three periods, pre-civil war, civil war and post-civil war. In the pre-civil war period, Mu□□wiya's image is portrayed as that of an obedient governor. His loyalty, bravery and piety all emerge. What is the reasoning behind this? Keshk believes this is very much related to the fact that the historical tragedy of the first civil war had not yet affected Mu□□wiya's persona.[76]

Keshk then continues by looking at 'civil war Mu□□wiya' and discusses the fact that the negative images which emerge are due to parallels made between □Al□'s struggle with Mu□□wiya and Mu□ammad's struggle with Ab□ Sufy□n.[77] Keshk then sheds light on two of the most important incidents in defining Mu□□wiya's image in Islamic history, the killing of □ujr b. □Ad□ al-Kind□ and the appointment of Yaz□d as heir apparent. Again, the question is raised, is Mu□□wiya the proverbial Arab sheikh or the despot? Keshk argues that this all depends on the way one views □ujr. Is he a rebel against the cause or a renowned companion of the Prophet? Likewise, when discussing Yaz□d, he analyses the regional and political factors that led to the appointment.[78]

Keshk's main point is that history and historiography are two

[75] Humphreys, *Mu□□wiya ibn Ab□ Sufy□n*, 93.
[76] Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya,* 18.
[77] Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya,* 53.
[78] Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya,* 101.

different things. Madelung takes this argument, as he does with every negative comment about Mu□□wiya, with absolute truth. Although Madelung does seem to accept the story at face value, we believe he misses out some of its subtleties, or maybe he purposely avoids them'.[79] Again Keshk believes that without considering the sources and the environment of the time, Madelung is amongst the historians who have reached the wrong conclusions:

> Mu□□wiya and his followers were easily stigmatized by the simple injection of Mu□□wiya's name among the confederates besieging Medina at the Battle of the Trench. This association remained with Mu□□wiya and his followers through their subsequent struggle with □Al□ and his supporters. Indeed, Mu□□wiya's character in these depictions was that of an evil, irreligious, cowardly usurper who was unworthy of the support of other Muslims, let alone the caliphate. This re-working of Mu□□wiya's image has been sufficiently effective that one modern scholar, namely Madelung, has accepted it as a true reflection of a historical figure, rather than the fictional story telling of the classical Muslim historians.[80]

However, Keshk's conclusion is rejected when examining the sources and the way they depict Mu□□wiya's decisions. Keshk seeks to explain the killing of □ujr b. □Ad□ by proposing the theory that historians emphasize certain elements of the story of □ujr to highlight a particular political bias, and that when this is done, they are taking away from the fact that 'these sources had a primary purpose that was lost on modern scholars in their use of the □ujr story'. The reply, however, is that the emphasis on these elements was to portray a clearer

[79] Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya,* 106.
[80] Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya,* 185.

understanding of the motives and background of the execution. Historians are in agreement on four major parts of the narrative. The first is a discussion of the disagreement which occurred between Ḥujr, al-Mughīrah and Zīyād. The second is that they discuss the background to his disobedience of the authorities in Kūfah, the third is his arrest and the fourth is his execution. Keshk states that while they all agree, they tend to emphasize one incident over another. The emphasis of one incident over another does not hide the over-arching question as to whether Muʿāwiya's conclusive decision concerning Ḥujr was that of a *ḥalīm* or that of a *jāhil*.

Muʿāwiya's does not display *ḥilm* in his dealings with Ḥujr. It was a ruthless decision that was undertaken, with no tolerance or respect shown to the men who tried to intercede on his behalf. The offer to exile them into different parts of the empire would no doubt have silenced his critics and the critics of Zīyād as well. But the government had reached a stage where dissidents were not tolerated, especially those who continued to display love towards ʿAlī, his family and their political beliefs. In each case, Shaban concludes that Muʿāwiya acted as a despot in his dealings with Ḥujr. [81]

This same point is stressed upon by Quṭb. While Quṭb may not be regarded as a historian as such, his later social influence in Islamic political circles is very clear.[82] Quṭb is extremely critical of the sources that depict Muʿāwiya as being of the earlier entourage of companions and a man of known piety.

---

[81] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 89.
[82] W. Shepard, "The Development of the Thought of Sayyid Quṭb as Reflected in Earlier and Later Editions of 'Social Justice in Islam"', *DWI,* 32 (1992); See also W. Shepard, "Sayyed Quṭb's Doctrine of Jaāilīyya", *IJMES*, 35 (2003), 521-45.

Mu□□wiya's biography and subsequent credentials are examined and he disagrees with the picture portrayed by some historians:

> The erroneous fable still persists that Mu□□wiya was a scribe who wrote down the revelations of Allah's Messenger. The truth is that when Ab□ Sufy□n embraced Islam, he besought the Prophet to give Mu□□wiya some measure of position in the eyes of the Arabs; thus he would be compensated of being slow to embrace Islam and of being one of those who had no precedence in the new religion. So the Prophet used Mu□□wiya for writing letters and contracts and agreements. But none of the companions ever said that he wrote down any of the Prophet's revelations, as was asserted by Mu□□wiya's partisans after he had assumed the throne.[83]

Yet no historian of the modern school has been as scathing in his attack on the Umayyads in general and Mu□□wiya in particular as Madelung:

> The cancer in the body of the caliphate which had nurtured and proved unable to excise because of his doting love for a corrupt and rapacious kin destroyed him. It was to continue to grow and to sweep away □Umar's caliphate of the Islamic meritocracy. □Uthm□n's successor, Mu□□wiya, turned it, as predicted by a well-known prophecy ascribed to Mu□ammad, into traditional despotic kingship.[84]

This view of Mu□□wiya, in stark contrast to Humphreys and others, is further emphasized in discussing what he viewed as *□ilm*:

> Mu□□wiya had developed a taste for despotism of the Roman Byzantine type. While endowed with a natural instinct for power

[83] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 183.
[84] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 140.

> and domination, his judgment of human nature was, contrary to his reputation, limited and primitive. He had come to understand that in statecraft, whenever bribery or intimidation would not reduce an opponent, murder, open or secret, was the most convenient and effective means.[85]

Madelung then analyzes the role of cursing in relation to Mu□□wiya's political finesse. □Al□ is portrayed by Mu□□wiya as a sworn enemy, in a manner which differs from the works of contemporary scholars, with his animosity displayed in public arenas:

> Particularly useful for Mu□□wiya's purposes was the public cursing of □Al□ in K□fah where, he hoped, it would bring out into the open the latent opposition to Umayyad rule, thus facilitating his measures of repression.[86]

Viewed as being pro-□Alid in its approach and direction, Morony's recent review of Madelung's book reflects the beliefs of others who saw Madelung's arguments as 'self serving and tendentious'.[87] Mattson views Madelung's research as 'not very scholarly and far from sober'.[88] They state that Madelung is selective in his sources, dismissing any report reflecting □Al□ in a bad light. 'The report, portraying al-□Abb□s and □Al□ in the most negative light, distinctly reflects the anti-H□shimite sentiments of Umayyad Sunnism and may not be entirely reliable in detail'.[89]

Discussion of Sources

[85] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 197-8.
[86] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 335.
[87] M.J. Morony, *NES*, 59, 2 (2000), 153-156.
[88] I. Mattson, *JR*, 78, 2 (1998), 321-322.
[89] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 63.

The earliest phase in Islamic history is narrated through literary sources such as belles-lettres, poems, chronicles, collections of *ḥadīth* attributed to Prophet Muḥammad or his companions, as well as theological epistles, and is supplemented by the Qurʾān itself.

Traditional as well as modern scholars would examine these sources to portray the events of the formative period of Islamic thought and origins.[90] However, a number of issues arise, especially when examining the caliphate of Muʿāwiya. These sources are, in many cases, written years after the events and are not contemporary. This, to Donner, 'violates the first law of the historian, which is to use contemporary sources whenever possible'.[91] Secondly, there are contradictions in the narratives as well as 'chronological discrepancies and absurdities'. Thirdly, a question mark is placed against the political aims of the narrator to serve the interest of a particular figure that may have affected the study.[92]
Crone stated that seeking to analyse the truth regarding the origin of Islam is impossible, saying that this evidence 'bears all the marks of having been through the mill of rabbinic arguments and subsequently tidied up'.[93] Crone saw the development of Islam as one blighted with dissention and difference. The later part of the Umayyad Caliphate is where

[90] This can clearly be seen in Madelung's *The Succession to Muḥammad* where he states that 'work with the narrative sources, both those that have been available to historians for a long time and others which have been published recently, made it plain that their wholesale rejection as late fiction is unjustified and that with a judicious use of them a much more reliable and accurate portrait of the period can be drawn than has so far been realized'. (Preface)
[91] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 4.
[92] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 4.
[93] Patricia Crone, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 15.

there seems to be more stability. However, stability in circles of Islamic tradition was still uncertain. Collection of *ḥadīths* was prevalent. However, some were tampered with, while others were oral in their terminology, and there was now a point of tribal prejudice in narrating *ḥadīth*. Crone summarizes her scepticism:

> Whether one approaches Islamic historiography from the angle of the religious or the tribal tradition, its overall character thus remains the same; the bulk of it is debris of an obliterated past. The pattern in which the debris began to be arranged in the eighth century acquired the status of historiographical *sunnah* in the ninth, the century in which the classical works of history and *ḥadīth* were compiled.[94]

In *Hagarism*, Crone and Cook argue that historical studies on Islam should not focus on tradition but rather on philological, historical and archaeological data. This is because the influence of dogma on traditions, as well as a mass of contradictions, would mean that the Islamic traditions would be of no real historical value. Islam's origin can be understood through usage of the above data:

> Virtually all accounts of the early development of Islam take it as axiomatic that it is possible to elicit at least the outlines of the process from the Islamic sources. It is however well-known that these sources are not demonstrably early. There is no hard evidence for the existence of the Koran in any form before the last decade of the seventh century, and the tradition which places this rather opaque revelation in its historical context is not attested before the middle of the eighth. The historicity of the Islamic tradition is thus to some degree problematic: while

[94] Crone, *Slaves on Horses,* 10.

> there are no cogent internal grounds for rejecting it, there are equally no cogent external grounds for accepting it. In the circumstances it is not unreasonable to proceed in the usual fashion by presenting a sensibly edited version of the tradition as historical fact. But equally, it makes some sense to regard the tradition as without determinate historical content, and to insist that what purport to be accounts of religious events in the seventh century are utilizable only for the study of religious ideas in the eighth. The Islamic sources provide plenty of scope for the implementation of these different approaches, but offer little that can be used in any decisive way to arbitrate between them. The only way out of the dilemma is thus to step outside the Islamic tradition altogether and start again.[95]

An early and continuous written tradition is clear for ʿAʿami. Furthermore, in defending the *isnād* system from the criticism of Schacht, a number of points are elucidated.[96] The first is related to Schacht's belief that the *isnād* system begins in the early part of the 2nd century. Traditions relating to a request for *isnād* in the period of ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya prove, according to ʿAʿami, that *isnād* was required as early as that period. Secondly, *isnāds* were an important rather than minor part of a *ḥadīth*. As their appearance from the time of the Prophet reveals, they were in fact part of a developing science. Thirdly, while there is agreement that certain *ḥadīth* have a faulty *isnād* system, ʿAʿami believes this has no bearing on the development of the system. Fourthly, isolated *ḥadīths* did not gain any kind of new authority to help in their reliability, but to ʿAʿami, this was because repetition may not have been

[95] Patricia Crone and Michael Cook, *Hagarism: The Making Of The Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 3.
[96] M. M. ʿAʿami, *Studies in Early ʿadith Literature* (Indianapolis: American Trust Publications, 1992), 1-211.

required or seen as necessary at the time. Fifthly, a family *isnād* could at times be doubtful, but at others be strong. Their presence indicated that they would be used as narrators of traditions.

Juynboll admits that, while there may have been recordings of what the Prophet said and did in his lifetime, this was not very prevalent. However, he does believe that the date for the appearance of *isnāds* is around the end of the 1st century, earlier than Schacht's proposal.

> The earliest origin of standardized *ḥadīth* cannot be traced back earlier than, at most, to the seventies or eighties of the first century. What had preceded this was…still unstructured and still unstandardized material of edifying contents…[97]

This conclusion is partly the result of a lack of use of the Prophetic *ḥadīths* in the time of the first caliphs, who tended to resort to personal opinion. The *sunnah* was still being defined. ʿUmar II is credited with making the first real attempt to codify the *sunnah*:

> The first man to apply himself to the concept *sunnat an-nabī* more than to *sunnahs* ascribed to other persons or localities was, as Muslim sources inform us, ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-Azīz. His request to Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr ibn Ḥazm and al-Zuhrī to note down what *ʿilm* they possessed is well known and has already been dealt with extensively by others.[98]

Juynboll states that while 'genuine material may be present in

---

[97] G.H.A. Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and the Authorship of Early Ḥadīth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 23.
[98] Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition*, 34.

the canonical collections',[99] he does accept that fabrication took place on quite a large scale.

To Donner, the civil wars and dissensions, along with the rival groups within and external to the Quraysh, allow for a narrative that portrays Islamic origins. Furthermore, all these groups which claimed leadership, be it the Sh□□□, the Umayyad, or the early Khaw□rij, allow us to confirm the outlines of Islamic history, in what Donner refers to as 'multiple orthodoxies'.[100] A proper study of Mu□□wiya leads to a radical reassessment of early Islamic history and the reasons behind the emergence of later theological schools. While there are disagreements within the narratives, they are disagreements that concern the interpretation of a particular incident, not the incident itself. Donner states when referring to the sources that:

> All agree on the sequence of Ab□ Bakr, □Umar, □Uthm□n and □Al□ as the first four caliphs (whether legitimate or not), on the manner of succession of each, on the main events taking place during their reign. All agree that □Uthm□n was murdered in office, that Mu□□wiya and his family raised the banner of vengeance for the murdered caliph, that □al□a and al-Zubayr fought against □Al□ and died at the battle of the Camel near al-Ba□ra, that Mu□□wiya and □Al□ faced one another in a military encounter at □iff□n (although they may be suspect on the outcome of the battle),[101] that the two sides agreed to arbitrate their dispute (although they disagree on the results of the arbitration).[102]

---

[99] Herbert Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2000), 29.
[100] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 286.
[101] Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 203 n.30 - Crone discusses a Syriac source which omits □Al□ from the list of caliphs and presents □iff□n as a victory for Mu□□wiya, a source reflecting the lost Syrian Umayyad tradition.
[102] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 286-287.

This consensus does not reflect a process of myth-making as some radical revisionist historians would seek to conclude. Nor does it:

> represent a fiction that arose before the coalescence of the Islamic historiographical tradition. Who had this authority and power to allow such a fable to impose itself on the community of the believers. This fiction would have had to have been placed no later than 75 AH. But during this period, there were people who had lived and clearly would be able to remember the events of the 30's AH. These people would have scrutinised this view in depth. The reality is that the consensus exists because the events happened in the way described by the sources. These incidents were now facts well-known in the community of believers. Each informant would narrate the same event, but then they would add their own interpretation, be it with a political or a theological bias. A person could not fabricate material about ʿUthmān's death or Muʿāwiya and ʿAlī 's battle, he could however add his own interpretation to proceedings. The community present would have known the details of the story, but may have had their own opinions as to the legitimacy of the defendant and the claimants in the events. The narrator would emphasise a certain theme or incident more than another, but this was to ensure his interpretation could be included, otherwise the people had knowledge of the details of the actual event. At times, they may distort by omitting certain vital details. But the outline of the issue could not be altered. But they had to recognise the limits which the received tradition had established.[103]

Hence, when examining the historiography of Muʿāwiya's leadership, we reject the sceptics approach to the sources who believe that there is no way of reconstructing Islamic origins

[103] J. Lassner, *Islamic Revolution and Historical Memory* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1986), 131-132.

and the debates that occurred in the period of his rule. The inter-textual approach allows us to read the different versions and understand the different ways in which the sources depict Mu□□wiya's authority and leadership.

.....
.....
.....

Particular detail shall be paid in our study to the conditions for leadership which are mentioned in these sources in order to examine Mu□□wiya's reign. The thesis contends that Mu□□wiya's reign as leader marks the shift from caliphate to kingship in light of the conditions of leadership stipulated in the sources. Furthermore, the theory that sources which are pro-□Alid indicate Im□m□ bias is questioned and indeed rejected. While Petersen seeks to portray al-□abar□ as anti-Umayyad, pro-□Abb□sid and Sh□□□, this opinion has to be rejected considering he does not condemn the Umayyad caliphate, and certainly does not believe it was an illegal usurpation of power. The respect given to □Abdallah b. □Abb□s only highlights his trusted role in the eyes of □Al□.[104] Al-□abar□'s respect for □Al□ is because he is viewed as being one of the rightly guided caliphs and not because of Sh□'ite sentiments. To simply state that because the Ism□□il□s were openly active, and therefore influenced his opinions, is to degrade al-□abar□'s stature and honour.[105]

This thesis, using through the medium of inter-textual analysis, shall propose a fresh look at the sources, reports and traditions whose potential to yield evidence of the nature of

[104] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 3350-3354.
[105] Petersen, *Al□ and Mu'□wiya*, 149-158 – Petersen's view stems from his rejection of Ab□ Mikhnaf.

authority and leadership in the formative period of Islamic thought which have not yet been exploited.

This study seeks to adopt a methodological framework which recognises my own position in relation to the research subject, namely as a Muslim seeking to understand the formative part of Islamic history and as an active student within the tradition I engage in. However, it must be stated that I come from a tradition in which Mu□□wiya is viewed negatively. The question then arises as to whether this will affect my research and whether the thesis can ever be separated from this negative viewpoint. While it is true that the thesis can never be separated from this particular perspective, this does not deny that the fact that the research may be undertaken from a committed point of view. A dialogical approach, as espoused by Gavin Flood, will allow us to understand and study the source material as well as to study any subject within religious thought through being 'reflexively aware of its assumptions and limitations, and rather than a proclaimed value-free description, can consciously bring to its object paradigms external to it'.[106] This 'dialogical reflexivity'[107] allows for a study based upon a critical engagement with the source material while at the same time recognising my position in relation to the tradition which provides a key contribution to academic literature.[108]

The first chapter discusses the development of Islamic history

[106] Gavin Flood, *Beyond Phenomenology*: *Rethinking the Study of Religion* (London: Cassell, 1999), 223.
[107] Flood, *Beyond Phenomenology,* 226.
[108] See Russell T. McCutcheon, "General Introduction" in *The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion*, ed. Russell T. McCutcheon (London: Cassell, 1999), 3.

and historiography. It examines the way material was preserved in pre-Islamic Arabia and when this material then transferred into written form. Furthermore, it examines the question as to whether sources are to be dismissed simply because they were not contemporary with the event and whether there is an argument that these sources may have been preserved by people who were eager to preserve and transcribe their history. The chapter then assesses the relationship between the preservation of writing and the debate concerning legitimacy and authority that had arisen in the early community of believers.

The second chapter is a survey of the sources from the 3rd to the 6th century that discuss Mu□□wiya's leadership, which is crucial in allowing us to depict the views concerning his authority and leadership. In our study, a number of different works have been used which we divide into four categories in order to discuss the issue of authority and leadership. They are divided as follows:

The first category is that of *adab* works. While the scholars of *□ad□th* in the 2nd or 3rd century would be concerned with gathering material to serve the religion and incorporate these materials within the belief system, the *adab* scholar would be concerned in gathering this material for themselves whilst the *ad□b* would search for all types of knowledge.

Our second category is that of historical works. The third category is theological works. The final category is works of jurisprudence.

Historical, theological, jurisprudential and *adab* literature form the basis of the narratives relating to the period in and

around the *fitnah* and provide adequate evidence that the theory of the schools can be rejected and that through source criticism, the similarities and contradictions in narratives display no clear political and ideological motive in their compilation. Furthermore, the belief that the issue of the legitimacy of the caliph, his authority and the scope of this authority arose after the civil wars is also called into question and scrutinised.

Chapter three is an examination of the concept of authority and leadership in the *adab*, theological and historical sources. The conditions for leadership are discussed, including the rational and tradition arguments for the necessity of a leader in the Islamic state, and the importance of *ʿilm* and *shujāʿa* as characteristics of the caliph of the state. The sources discuss the issue of leadership becoming a major controversy; merely days after Muḥammad had died, a problem arose between Abū Bakr and ʿAlī at Saqīfah. The characteristics of *ʿilm* and *shujāʿa* emerge at this early stage as vital in the make-up of the caliph.

Chapter four is an analysis of Muʿāwiya's biography in light of the early historical literature. In studying Muʿāwiya's life and leadership, it is vital to understand the complex lineage and tribal structures of ancient Arabia. In ancient Arabia, families and clans were not only complex entities, but their relations with each other were perceived as being even more complex. If one were a member of a particular lineage, then one would claim descent from a common ancestor. These discussions concerning lineages would allow two people to know whether they were to view each other as being neutral, blood enemies or allies. The chapter assesses the motives for his conversion to Islam as well

as his role in the formative years of the religion of Islam.

Chapter five examines Mu□□wiya's *□ilm*. Scholars have sought to define Mu□□wiya as a man of *□ilm* and *dah□'* (guile). These are the attributes which they use to describe his decisions as both governor and caliph of the Islamic state. *□ilm* and *dah□'*[109] were two attributes which Mu□□wiya was renowned for. The chapter examines the definition of *□ilm* and its application in light of the killing of □ujr b. □Ad□.

Chapter six examines Mu□□wiya's *shuj□□a*. Mu□□wiya's leadership is often described as being successful because of the *shuj□□a* that he displayed in leading the armed forces both on land and sea. Theological and historical works from the 3rd to the 6th century discuss the importance of *shuj□□a* as a condition for leadership.[110] The *khal□fah's* role was to defend the Muslim community from opposition and outside forces. He was to remove oppression and address the grievances of the citizens of the state.[111] Mu□□wiya's military exploits are described within the corpus of the narrations where he is viewed as the ideal commander. The chapter assesses his military exploits in relation to the killing of □Uthm□n and the Battle of □iff□n.

The last chapter examines Mu□□wiya's *□ilm*. The Umayyad caliphs viewed themselves as God's deputies on earth. This was seen as their claim to religious authority. This title is perceived as having three implications in Islamic thought. The first

---

[109] Ahmad b. Ab□ Ya□q□b al-Ya□q□b□, *Kit□b al-T□r□kh* (Leiden: Brill, 1883), vol. 2, 238; al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 2, 206.
[110] Al-Sijist□n□, *Kit□b al-Iftikh□r,*160; "Urjuza", tr. in Poonawala, *Al-Qa□□ al-Num□n*, 27; al-Muf□d, *Kit□b al-Irsh□d*, 3; al-Ash□ar□, *Kit□b al-Luma'*, in R.J. McCarthy, *The Theology of al-Ash□ar□*, 115; Sh□r□z□, *al-Ish□rah*, 176; al-D□b, *Im□m al-□□ramayn*, 145.
[111] al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tamh□d*, 185-186.

implication is that this was a title claimed by all Umayyad caliphs who had ruled for over a year. Secondly, it was viewed as an official designation for the Umayyad head of state. Thirdly, when the title *khal□fah* was discussed, it was in reference to God's deputies on earth. When examining the vastness of the word *□ilm*, we differentiate between Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* as personal experiences handed down by generations, or knowledge formed by tradition,[112] and *□ilm* as Divine knowledge received from God, which is then used to guide the Muslims in all their religious affairs. The chapter assesses Mu□□wiya's knowledge in light of the key decisions he made as caliph.

[112] Knowledge formed by tradition, akin to MacIntyre's ideas about ethics in A. MacIntyre, *A Short History of Ethics* (London: Routledge, 1967).

Chapter 1

Source Critical Methodology

The function of this chapter is to assess the different approaches to the study of the classical texts. The examination of the differing opinions regarding Islamic history reveals various approaches to the question of the sources of Islamic origins. A growing scepticism has largely confounded the study

of early Islamic history. The confidence of many historians relating to Islamic origins was undermined by the unreliability of the early sources. The 1st century of Islam is viewed as being an important but equally problematic period. The most important events in Islamic history occur in this era. Muslims view this period as a golden age for within the epoch the Qur□□n was revealed alongside Mu□ammad, and caliphs were elected to rule and expand the state while at the same time it was a period of theological and political disputes. It is vital, therefore, that we have an understanding of the beginnings of historical writing in the Islamic community in a historical context as well as understand why it is that the narratives have reached us in the way that they have.[113] While historical works have sought to narrate events, studies on Islamic historiography have sought to understand the purpose and opinions of different historians and their respective works.[114] Scholars have either sought to study the genre as a whole[115] or would examine individual historians or narrators.[116] Three distinct schools emerged in Islamic historiographical circles: the sceptics, the moderates and the reactionaries.

---

[113] S. Gunther, "Assessing the Sources of Classical Arabic Compilations: The Issue of Categories and Methodologies", *BJMES*, 32, 1 (2005), 75-99.
[114] K. Keshk, *The Historian's Mu□wiyah: The Depiction of Mu□wiyah in the Early Islamic Sources* (Saarbrucken: VDM Verlag Dr Muller, 2008).
[115] On early Muslim historiography, see F. A. Rosenthal, *History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1968); T. Kh□lid□, *Arab Historical Thought in the Classical Period* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*; T. el-□ibr□, *Reinterpreting Islamic Historiography: Har□n al-Rash□d and the Narrative of the 'Abb□sid Caliphate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
[116] On Ab□ Mikhnaf as an example, see K. S. al-Jabbur□, *Nu□□s min T□r□kh Ab□ Mikhnaf L□□ b. Ya□y□ b. Sa'□d al-J□mid□ al-Azd□ l-K□f□ l-Mutawaffa* [157 H] (Beirut: D□r al-Ras□l al-Akram, 1999); On Ibn As□k□r, see J. Lindsay, *Ibn As□k□r and Early Islamic History* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2001); On al-□abar□, see U. Martensson, "Discourse and Historical Analysis: The Case of al-□abar□'s History of the Messengers and the Kings", *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 16 (2005), 287-331.

The history of the caliphate of Mu□□wiya and the historiography of this period are two completely different discussions. In the analysis of the history of this period, the discussion concerns the events and the main figures involved. The historiography of the period, however, examines the background of the historian, the political affiliation of the historian as well as the government ideology and policy at the time when the work was compiled. How intertwined are history and theology? 'The social and didactic function of historical writing is a well-known phenomenon'.[117] Politics, religion and terminology are all part of the way historians view the events and lives of those who preceded them:

> Any political and physical conflict must in the nature of things assume a fundamentally religious aspect; any opinion is a legal constituent of Islamic society and is by its very essence entitled to that religious legitimacy which is obtainable only by invocation of the Prophet tradition or the views of the very early generations. The latter's political distinctions are brought into the argumentation on topical controversial issues, and the conflicts are generally so alternative that their very nature prevents loyalty to the past.[118]

Therefore, in studying the leadership of Mu□□wiya, the chapter will seek to conclude with a method for studying the different genres of literature from the 3rd/9th century.

Development of Islamic Historiography

Oral Tradition

[117] Petersen, *□Al□ and Mu□□wiya*, 13.
[118] Petersen, *□Al□ and Mu□□wiya*, 16.

Reading and writing were rare skills in ancient Arabia; indeed, some traditions relate that, at the birth of Islam, there were seventeen literate people in the trading city of Mecca.[119] The northern Arabs preserved history through oral tradition.[120] Great exploits and social affairs were often narrated, in addition to descriptions of their gods. Genealogies, battles and raids were often discussed. Such accounts would be connected to the views of the society of the time as well as its organization. Emphasis was placed on Bedouin virtues and family origins as well as noble deeds and exploits. Tribes possessed narratives and tales of their past.

Poetry

In oral accounts, poetry played a major role, and was placed at the beginning of a narration and at its end.[121] Poetry was the stamp which approved the account, giving it 'vitality and authority'.[122] Later, poetry would be evidence in confirming the reliability of a story, as Ibn F□ris states:

> Poetry is the register of the Arabs, through which genealogies are preserved and great deeds are displayed, and from which language is learned...[123]

The poet was a leader in the community. He was the prophet,

[119] Ibn □Abd Rabbih, *al-□Iqd al Far□d*, vol. 4, 157, quoted in A□am□ (2000), 1.
[120] G. Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam,* tr. Uwe Vagelpohl (London: Routledge, 2006), Preface.
[121] S. Stetkevych, *The Mute Immortals Speak: Pre-Islamic Poetry and the Poetics of Ritual* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993). See also *Early Islamic Poetry and Poetics: The Formation of the Classical Islamic World* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Variorum, 2009), 37.
[122] A. A. D□r□, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 19.
[123] Ya□y□ b. □Al□ Kha□□b al-Tabr□z□, *Sharḥ al-Ḥam□sah* (Cairo, 1916), vol. 1, 3.

soothsayer and priest of the clan. Poetry was viewed as being a lofty mental activity and one of great artistic skill. To Ibn Sal□m, it was the register of their learning and the final word of their wisdom which they adopted and followed.[124]

According to Ibn Sal□m, Arabic poetry began with short pieces made up of one or two lines, or several more. The poems then began to get longer, and, by the end of the 6th century, the *qa□□dah* was established. Poets were placed in order of merit, with titles such as stallion given to the most honoured of them.

Al-Ya□q□b□, writing in the 10th century, states:

> For the Arabs, poetry took the place of philosophy and most of the sciences…In fact, the Arabs had nothing to refer to for their opinions and actions except poetry. It was with poetry that they fought; it was poetry they quoted; in it they vied in virtue, through it they exchanged oaths and with it they exerted themselves against each other; in it they were praised or blamed.[125]

Since a poet has skills in rhythm and words, his message therefore would naturally be given through verses, portraying history as it was heard.[126] A transmitter would then have the role of explaining the verses. Thus the role of the commentator for a piece of poetry was introduced from that period. □Uk□□ and Yathrib markets had ports connected to them such as Jeddah.

---

[124] Muḥammad b. Sall□m al-Jumaḥ□, *□abaq□t fuḥ□l al-shu□ar□□*, ed. A. M. Shakir (Cairo, 1952), 22.
[125] Al-Ya□q□b□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 262, quoted in Kh□lid□, *Arabic Historical Thought* (1994).
[126] On later poetry, see also Wilferd Madelung, "The H□shim□y□t of al-Kumayt and H□shim□ Sh□ʿism", *SI*, 70 (1989), 5-26, and W. □Araf□t, "The Historical Background to the Elegies on □Uthm□n b. □Aff□n Attributed to □assan b. Thabit", *BSOAS*, 33 (1970).

Tales[127] of sailors and different fleets arriving at the ports are described by poets like ʿarafah.[128] Markets were not reserved solely for engaging in commerce, poetry was also heard in the local bazaars. Eloquence and oral tradition were clearly visible in daily life.

The *qaṣīdah* (ode) was regarded as a vital source of oral tradition as well as the highest form of Arabic eloquence.[129] It would consist of three sections, one flowing onto the other.[130] Listeners would know the topic the poet was about to recite. The way he would tackle the topic and the difficulties of developing lyrical and thematic variations were much anticipated. This form of tradition was so highly regarded that judges would be employed to assess the best of the poets, with red leather tents carefully pitched for competitions. The winning poem would be placed in the careful trust of the Quraysh. ʿAlqamah b. ʿAbīdah of Tamīm composed poetry for the Ghassānid king al-Ḥārith, which won such acclaim that it led to the Quraysh describing it as 'the necklace of all time'.[131]

Furthermore, Arab oral expression had taken many forms, with only one type being recognized as poetry, rhyming prose, for example, known as *sajʿ*, is still used in certain parts of the Sudan. The rhythmic and rhyming regularity was so precise that some believed it was poetry. Addtionally, *rajaz* is another piece of rhythmic expression which is more regular than *sajʿ* and which

[127] See Patricia Crone, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004).
[128] *Muʿallaqah*, verses 3-4, in al-Tabrīzī, *Commentary*, 30.
[129] See Christopher Shackle and Stefan Sperl, "Qaṣīda Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa", 2 vols., in *Studies in Arabic Literature*, vol. 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
[130] Abū al-Faraj ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī* (Cairo, 1285), vol. 14, 43.
[131] Abū al-Faraj ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī* (Leiden, 1905), vol. 21, 173.

was also highly regarded. When examining the Qur□□n, the rhyming regularities of *saj□* and the rhythms of *rajaz* are present.[132] □aha □usayn was of the belief that the Arabic language should be divided into three separate categories - prose, verse and the Qur□□n.[133]

Proverbs were regarded as one of the earliest forms of oral tradition. Testaments of famous men, lines from *qa□□dahs* or parts of sermons would be used, recited and transmitted.[134] The Arabic proverbs would have much in common with Aramaic proverbs making it at times difficult to distinguish the origin of the said proverb. In *Nih□yat al-Arab*, Nuwayr□[135] discusses the proverbs of the Prophet and the later generations. Certain expressions which are present today emphasize the usage of past proverbs within language and are not to be taken as the invention of a philologist. One example being the tribal slogan of 'Support your fellow, be he wronging or wronged',[136] quoted in the *F□kh□r* of al-Mufa□□al b. Sal□mah.

Moreover, oratory, sermons and addresses played a fundamental role in traditional learning. Known as the *khu□bah*, many of the renowned anthologies narrate what was said.[137] These at times would become a source of competition, a war of words, employing classical and colloquial Arabic. In some cases, these may be

---

[132] Devin Stewart, "*Saj'* in the Qur'an: Prosody and Structure", *JAL,* 21 (1990).
[133] Z. Mubarak, *al-Nathr al-Fann□* (Cairo, 1934), vol. 1, 18.
[134] J. Montgomery, "Of Models and Amanuenses: The Remarks on the Qaṣ□da in Ibn Qutaybah's *Kit□b al-Shi'r wa-l-Shu'ar□*", in R. Hoyland and P. Kennedy (ed.), *Islamic Reflections, Arabic Musings: Studies in Honour of Alan Jones (*Oxford: Gibb Memorial Trust, 2004), 1-47.
[135] Aḥmad b. □Abd al-Wahh□b Nuwayr□, *Nih□yat al-ʿArab f□ fun□n al-Ad□b* (Cairo, 1342-48).
[136] Al-Mufa□□al b. Salamah, *F□kh□r*, ed. C.A. Storey (Leyden: Brill, 1915).
[137] T. Qu□buddin, "*Khu□ba*: The Evolution of Early Arabic Oration", in *Classical Arabic Humanities in their Own Terms: Festschrift for Wolfhart Heinrichs on his 65th Birthday*, ed. Beatrice Gruendler (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2008), 176-273.

utterances of what should have been said rather than what was said. The orator had a political and social role, although he was not necessarily as renowned as the poet. Orations of the renowned and not so renowned would be memorized, with a figure such as Quss b. Sa□□dah al-Iy□d□ being an example. This form of tradition would have a vital impact on the shaping of government and authority at a later date, with sermons such as the Prophet's farewell address and those between □Al□ and Mu□□wiya being constantly discussed.

Ayy□m al-□Arab

The *Ayy□m* stories would be heard in evening tribal meetings and were tribal accounts transmitted in an oral manner. Until the 8th century, these accounts belonged uniquely to the respective tribe until they were compiled. However, political and social influences had definitely affected the collected *Ayy□m* literature. Chronological confusion and partisanship is clear. While they may not be so well organized, some history can be explored. Genealogists and historians developed a keen interest in the *Ayy□m* because of the presence of poetry within them. Historical accounts would eventually employ the *Ayy□m* literature:

> The study of the *Ayy□m al-□Arab* is a branch of learning in which one studies the momentous events and great ordeal which occurred among the Arab tribes…and it is appropriate that the above mentioned field of learning be placed among the branches of history.[138]

[138] Mu□□af□ b. □Abdull□h Hajj□ Khal□f, *Kashf al-ẓun□n □an as□m□ al-kutub wa-al-fun□n,* ed. Gustav Flugel, 7 vols. (Leipzig and London: 1835-58), vol. 1,

To historians, the *Ayy□m* were direct accounts, combining prose and poetry which provided a picture of the tribal world. The reality remained that the notion of time was limited, and only placed in relation to events that occurred:

> The era of *j□hil□yyah* had left no written literature, and was rather a period of oral culture. Although its legacy in general contributed to the persistent interest in *Ayy□m* and in genealogies, and to the survival of a certain style in relating accounts, the pseudo-historical story-telling style, it is nevertheless devoid of any genuine historical view of its subject matter.[139]

The Qur□□n played a major role in the shift towards understanding, preserving and recording history. At first it retraced history back to the beginning of creation, in turn raising a question relating to the Arab understanding of history.

> Many were the Ways of Life that have passed away before you: travel through the earth, and see what was the end of those who rejected Truth.[140]

Past nations were discussed, their ways examined and the lessons to be learned from them were analysed:

> To every people is a term appointed: when their term is reached, not an hour can they cause delay, nor (an hour) can they advance (it in anticipation).[141]

204.
[139] D□r□, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs*, 20.
[140] Qur□□n 3:137.
[141] Qur□□n 10:49.

Spiritual and ethical precepts were stressed:

> Or do ye think that ye shall enter the Garden (of bliss) without such (trials) as came to those who passed away before you? They encountered suffering and adversity, and were so shaken in spirit that even the Messenger and those of faith who were with him cried: "When (will come) the help of Allah?" Ah! Verily, the help of Allah is (always) near![142]

Prophetic missions were narrated.

> Rejected were the messengers before thee: with patience and constancy they bore their rejection and their wrongs, until Our aid did reach them: there is none that can alter the words (and decrees) of Allah. Already hast thou received some account of those messengers.[143]

The Arabs were seen as the bearers of God's final words and the environment for His Prophetic message. This was an important period of history. ʿUmar's fixed calendar, the Hijra dating system, would help record the conquests in this period. Furthermore, names of warriors were recorded as well as the tribes to which their family belonged. Therefore, according to Dūrī, this trend reflected the two fundamental perspectives to emerge in the writing of history, one being an Islamic perspective, and the second being a very much tribal perspective:

> These two outlooks reflect the two great currents in early Islamic society; the tribal current represented by the enduring

[142] Qurʾān 2:214.
[143] Qurʾān 6:34.

> persistence of the tribal heritage, and the Islamic current embodied in spiritual principles and activities. Each of these two perspectives had a cultural in which it was predominant; the Islamic perspective thrived in Medīna, the abode of the Prophetic *sunnah*, and the tribal perspective in Kūfah and Baṣra, the two new garrison towns which were centres of tribal activity.[144]

Oral to Written Literature

Scholars now argued it was their role to protect the words and deeds of the Prophet. These words would play a role in providing spiritual direction to the Muslim community. Furthermore, they could be used in many areas of the administrative platform within the Islamic state. Military campaigns were discussed thoroughly. On the first level, they would relate the exploits which many great companions made alongside the Prophet. The companions would be seen as exemplars for future generations. Medīna was the place where the studies of the *Maghāzī* literature first emerged. However, the emergence of a study of the chain of a narration would place the *Maghāzī* literature under the same scrutiny as the *ḥadīth* literature.[145]

The *ḥadīth* specialist and jurist ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr seems to have been the founder of genre called *Maghāzī* literature.[146] His work is cited in al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Isḥāq and Ibn Kathīr. The revelations of the Qurʾān, as well as the Prophet's public and private life are covered. While some of his words were written,

---

[144] Dūrī, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs*, 22.
[145] C. Cahen, "History and Historians: From the Beginnings to the Time of al-Ṭabarī", *Religion, Learning and Science in the 'Abbāsid Period: The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 188-233.
[146] Dūrī, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs*, 25.

others emerged from dialogue within Umayyad courts.[147] His usage of *isnād* varies. The discussion surrounding an event like the Hijra has an *isnād*, while other events may not necessarily include one.[148] This could very much relate to the environment of the time and the importance of the *isnād*. ʿUrwah was a poet, and this fact is narrated at times. Furthermore, his association with the family of al-Zubayr enabled the gathering of historical material from the earliest available sources. The reality remained that the accounts which were available remained few.

The work of al-Zuhrī[149] is regarded as part of the development of the *Maghāzī* tradition. His research involved gathering *ʿaḥādīths* in circulation in Medīna, using his writing skills to assist his memory. His *sīrah* is structured, giving context to the period of ignorance which preceded Prophet Muḥammad. The Prophet's travels and decisions are discussed in depth. Furthermore, there are discussions on the first four caliphs, the issue of succession as well as the crisis of civil war. Furthermore, al-Zuhrī was a genealogist[150] of repute. His accounts were committed to writing. This was done systematically and his work was preserved in the Umayyad court.[151]

Historical writing therefore develops because of a number of reasons when examining the influence of al-Zuhrī and Ibn al-Zubayr. The interest in the events which affected the early Muslim community, their trials and tribulation which they had to overcome was one motive. Furthermore, there was a need to understand how to build and maintain a government system. A

[147] Muḥammad Ibn Sa'd, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (Beirut, 1947-60), vol. 5, 132ff.
[148] Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition.*
[149] Muhammad b. Muslim b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī (124/741).
[150] Dūrī, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs*, 28.
[151] N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), vol. 1, 20ff.

scholar's reputation would rise in relation to the work of the past generations that was documented.

However, this does not mean that all the traditions which were written were reliable. Wahb b. Munabbih, a Yemenite, is seen as an example of someone who created fabrications. His book *al-Mubtada'* sought to portray the divine mission. *Isrāʾīlīyāt* play a major role in the traditions he recounts through the use of Old Testament tales and myths seeking to explain that which was within the Qurʾān. Fabricated poetry is also included within the narrations. Wahb was from a school of narrators and storytellers, and his work is not viewed as being of scholarly repute.

A new movement in the development of historical writing was the introduction of scholars who were 'historians first and scholars of *ḥadīth* second'.[152] Ibn Isḥāq is an example. His *sīrah* consisted of narrating the history of creation until the Prophet as well as an examination of the Prophet's social and political life. The *sīrah* is seen as the oldest of the *sīrah* collections as reviewed by Ibn Hishām. *Maghāzī* literature was included within the work, alongside the stories of God's Prophets. His own studies, as well as the research of scholars such al-Zuhrī and ʿUrwah, form the basis of his work. *Isnāds* do not appear in traditions relating to the Meccan period, but do appear in the Medīnan accounts. However, his dependence on fabricated poetry, myths and the words of the People of the Book places the work under some suspicion. He[153] acknowledges his deficiencies. Another accusation labelled against him is his ʿAlid[154]

[152] Dūrī, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs*, 33.
[153] Dūrī, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs*, 35.
[154] Yāqūt b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī, *Irshād al-arīb ilā maʿrifat al-adīb*: *al-Muʿjam al-ʿUdaba* (Dictionary of Learned Men), ed. D. S. Margoliouth, 7 vols.,

tendencies in opposition to the Umayyads, yet this is questionable.

Historical works continued with Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Wāqidī. His work, *al Maghāzī*[155] is more structured than that of Ibn Isḥāq. Rather than using all the material which was available to him, using both the weak and the strong narrations, he tends to be more selective. The topic of discussion is presented, details examined, dates provided, governors mentioned. The *qiṣaṣ* and poetry, an element in Ibn Isḥāq, is not given this importance with al-Wāqidī. Hence he takes nothing from Ibn Isḥāq. His scrupulous attitude is seen in the way he places the Qurʾān, *ḥadīth* and *Maghāzī* literature together. Al-Wāqidī's other historical works are of fundamental importance, in many cases analysing the periods of civil war and their affects on the community. This structured and organised compilation would continue in the renowned *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Saʿd.[156]

Historians would focus on studies of genealogy or what became known as *Ansab* literature. The incentives were provided by the Umayyads to explore this area of research and eventual literature, with Muʿāwiya and Walīd II wanting registers of genealogies to be produced. One tribe would be the focus for the study of genealogy. This would later become more extensive and inclusive of many tribes by the 2nd century. Al-Naṣbah was the first to produce a genealogical work.[157] Furthermore, historians would now travel great lengths to study all the different areas

---

2nd edition (London: 1923-31), vol. 6, 400.

[155] J.M.B. Jones, "The Chronology of the *Maghāzī*: a Textual Survey", *BSOAS*, XIX (1957), 245ff.

[156] See also Maria Dakake on the difference between Shīʿī and Sunnī source development in *The Charismatic Community: Shīʿite Identity in Early Islam* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2007).

[157] Abū Yaqẓān al-Nasabba (d. 190/805).

of knowledge, *sunnah*, *Maghāzī* and genealogy. Al-Balādhurī was the first of the representatives of this field. His two monumental works, *Futūḥ al-Buldān* and *Ansāb al-Ashrāf,* provide a compilation of both the conquests as well the genealogies within the Islamic communities history. He would travel, collect, examine and then propose as balanced and disciplined an image as was possible. He would not only subject his work to criticism, but the work of his predecessors such as al-Wāqidī and Abū Mikhnaf. Oral and written tradition is included. ʿAbbāsid thought did not seem to affect his writings. Al-Yaʿqūbī's *Tārīkh* also stems from research based on widespread travel, collection of sources and thorough examination. Once again, there is reference to past scholars and their opinions as well as criticism of his own collections. However, *isnāds* are not given important attention, with the sources used mentioned at the beginning of his work. In contrast to al-Yaʿqūbī and al-Balādhurī, al-Dīnawarī's[158] narratives show more of an ʿAbbāsid inclination and less personal criticism.

The final work to be examined is that of the renowned al-Ṭabarī. His works are viewed as the zenith of historical collections in the early period and his *Tārīkh al-rusul wal-mulūk* is revered highly. Al-Ṭabarī would travel to many countries to gain knowledge and wisdom, including Iraq, Syria and Egypt. Being a scholar of *ḥadīth*, he places a major focus within his compilation on the importance of the *isnād*. The biography of the Prophet, as well as the movements of the community, are examined. The community would be fundamental in al-Ṭabarī's thought. A great number of sources are explained by al-Ṭabarī who wanted all accounts to be collected in one voluminous work, a collection of major significance.

[158] Abū Ḥanīfah Aḥmad b. Dawūd al-Dīnawarī, *al-Akhbār al-ṭiwāl* (Leiden: 1888).

Modern scholarship has sought to develop and refresh the approach to this area. Historians come forward with different approaches, but the aim is the same in seeking to gain a clearer and more concise picture of the movements at hand and the opinions given, the study of Islamic historiography, when examining the *ḥadīths* within the books of Islamic history, Robinson put forward a three-part typology of historiography.[159] His aim was to provide order to the corpus of traditions in Islam. The first part is chronography, placing events according to their dates in Islamic history. The importance of dates cannot be underestimated. While some considered beginning the calendar at the time of the Prophet's death, the actual lunar-based calendar began from the year of the migration to Medīna, otherwise known as the Hijra, and which corresponds to 622 AD. Ibn al-Athīr argued that ʿUmar proposed this idea, while others point to Muḥammad himself.[160] The *Hijrī* dates were seen on coins and papyri as well as inscriptions. Christians living under the Islamic state in the 7th century used the *Hijrī* dates in Syriac historical work.

The second division was a focus on biographies. The lives of the Prophet and prominent companions are examined, stating that 'coverage usually being representative rather than comprehensive'.[161] These companions are in many cases seen as being heroic in their ways and thoughts. The third part is titled prosopography. A focus here is on the study of a social group and their ways. Seen in Western circles, they are normally described as biographical dictionaries. Three schools emerge in

[159] C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, xxiv.
[160] Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 21.
[161] Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, xxiv.

Islamic historiography: the sceptics, the moderates and the reactionaries. Amongst the questions that are asked is, what kind of motives did the Muslims have in writing about the historical origins of Islam? Some may argue that the motive is purely historiographical, while others may speak of a religious ascetic responsibility on the part of the authors.

Scepticism

Goldziher sought to show the complexities within oral tradition. His 1890 epochal study of *ḥadīth* was the first to examine *ḥadīth* within the context of the political, dogmatic, juristic and ideological exigencies of the 2nd/3rd century of Islam.[162] The vast number of *ḥadīths* within the collections, and his familiarity with them, gave him 'sceptical caution rather than optimistic trust'.[163] *Ḥadīth*s, according to Goldziher, were to be understood as a reflection of later interests, motives for compilation, even though each narration had a chain of narrators linked to the Prophet or the first generation of companions. To classify a narration as weak, based on a study of the biography of the narrators was not necessarily important as it was the sound *ḥadīths* which were scrutinized by Goldziher. In showing that these were later forgeries, the reliability of the corpus of literature and their chains were now under threat. Therefore, the very methods employed by Muslim scholars were now under scrutiny.

To Goldziher, *ḥadīth* literature and historical accounts were two completely different subjects. Goldziher had remained positive

[162] I. Goldziher, *Moḥamedanische Studien* (first published 1890), vol. 2, tr. into English by C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern under the title *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2 (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967-71).
[163] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 19.

when studying history, his stance seemingly affirming the reliability of the historical *akhbār* over that of the Prophetic *ḥadīths*.

However, for Goldziher, when studying a *ḥadīth*, the influence of political, social and theological issues are clear though they were not necessarily prevalent at the suggested time of narration. He states that *ḥadīths* could:

> not serve as a document for the history of the infancy of Islam, but rather as a reflection of the tendencies which appeared in the community during the maturer stages of its development.[164]

Goldziher's observations stemmed from different reasons. Firstly, the younger companions of Muḥammad seemed to narrate more of his life than the older companions who would have witnessed the rise of Islam and heard more of his sermons and sayings. Contradictions were abundant, according to Goldziher, as well as the fact that what was narrated in a late tradition was not attested to in the earlier one. Furthermore, these later narrations do not make reference to an earlier narration and the terms which are used imply an oral rather than written tradition.

This is not to deny that Goldziher denied all literature from the early period. The presence of *ṣaḥīfahs*, a written form of the deeds of the Prophet preserved by his companions, is a concept which is accepted. When these companions passed away, the use of *isnād* would begin in the following generation.[165] However, politics, theology and tribal influence play a major

[164] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies,* vol. 2, 19.
[165] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 22.

role in the reliability of a *ḥadīth*; an ʿAlid would have praised the family of the Prophet while an Umayyad would protect his own clan:

> It is not surprising that, among the hotly debated controversial issues of Islam, whether political or doctrinal, there is not one in which the champions of the various views are unable to cite a number of traditions, all equipped with imposing *isnāds*.[166]

These issues would have influenced the narration at first orally and then later through the written form.

Goldziher saw the Umayyads as secular, but more importantly, he saw the ʿAbbāsids as more theocratic. In their period of rule, caliphs in many cases required the stamp of approval of the *ʿulamāʾ*. Public life was to be given a more religious character, in turn giving official recognition to the *sunnah*. However, the problem remained for Goldziher that there seemed to be little material which would go back to the period of the Prophet, and therefore many gaps would emerge. To Goldziher, these gaps were filled by many fabricated *ḥadīths*:

> where no traditional matter was to be had, men speedily began to fabricate it. The greater the demand, the busier was invention with the manufacture of apocryphal traditions in support of the respective theses.[167]

The widespread fabrication of *ḥadīth* meant that some would reject the whole corpus of traditions. However, another reaction to the invention of *ḥadīth* was to introduce the *isnād* system.

---

[166] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 44.
[167] I. Goldziher, *The Principles of Law in Islam*, vol. 8, 301, in *The Historian's History of the World,* ed. H. S. Williams (London, 1907).

The problem here was that there were certain *ḥadīths* which only narrate back to the companions, known as *aḥādīth mawqūfah,* would be changed to *aḥādīth marfūʿah* and traced back to the Prophet or to that specific generation. Furthermore, if the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik[168] is taken as the first formal collection, then the collections of *ḥadīth* began from the end of the 2nd century.

While Goldziher sought to make sense of the historical literature, a school of sceptics emerged which emphasized a different argument. While this school of scholars admits that the narrations relating to Islamic origins are products of oral transmission, they deny that there is any recoverable material which would allow for a proper portrayal of the early Islamic period:

> According to the sceptical view, whatever tidbit of historical fact the traditions may once have contained has either been redacted out of existence, or is so completely buried in a matrix of later accretions as to be impossible to isolate.[169]

This school was headed by Joseph Schacht and first appears in his book *Origins of Muḥammadan Jurisprudence*. Schacht's main discussion centres on Islamic law. The main Islamic figure within discussion here, one may argue, is al-Shāfiʿī.[170] This could be understood by the fact that the term *sunnah* for al-Shāfiʿī was defined as the practise and ways of the Prophet rather than the living tradition of the Muslim community of the later generations. It was al-Shāfiʿī who identified the *sunnah* with the contents of the *ḥadīth* from the Prophet. To al-Shāfiʿī, if an *isnād* of a *ḥadīth* is reliable, and if it traces back to

[168] Imām Mālik b. Anas (179/795).
[169] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 20.
[170] Imām al-Shafiʿī, 150/767.

the Prophet, then it is to be given precedence over a narration from the companions; this was instrumental for Schacht:

> Two generations before Sh□fi□□ reference to traditions from the companions and successors was the rule, traditions from the Prophet himself the exception, and it was left to Sh□fi□□ to make the exception the principle. We shall have to conclude that, generally and broadly speaking, traditions from the companions and successors are earlier than those from the Prophet…[171]

Muslim scholarship on *□ad□th* was rejected. To Schacht and Stetter,[172] *□ad□ths* within collections such as Bukh□r□ and Muslim originated in the middle of the 2nd century AH and not with the Prophet. In Schacht's theory, a date of a *□ad□th* was to be known from when it first appears in a legal discussion. Schacht's main interest lay in the attribution of law-related statements related to individuals from the first and second generations. His most perceptive insights lie in the field of the *isn□d* of a *□ad□th*. A statement made in one context reappears in the words of another companion in a different context. Statements made in one generation are repetitions of a previous generation. Schacht views this as the act of scholars, who take information from the lowest source available to them and trace it to higher authorities:

> Whenever we find, as frequently happens, alleged opinions of the successors, alleged decisions of the companions, and alleged traditions from the Prophet side by side, we must as a rule and

[171] J. Schacht, *Origins of Mu□ammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950), 3.
[172] See H. Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam*, 17, for a discussion on Eckart Stetter's 1965 dissertation, which examines the *topoi* and schemata in *□ad□ths* using a representative segment from Bukh□r□'s *□ah□h*. Schacht and Stetter suggest plausible mechanisms for the creation of false *□ad□ths*.

> until the contrary is proved, consider the opinions of the successors as the starting point, and the traditions from the companions and from the Prophet as secondary developments, intended to provide higher authority for the doctrine in question.[173]

Schacht examines the concept of incompleteness. This is a characteristic feature of an *isnād*. Thus one may have a chain of A-B-C-F-H. The problem arises that, if a complete chain is found in another narration, one may argue that tampering within the *ḥadīth* has taken place; a series of conclusions are drawn from this:

> Companion *ḥadīths* are later than successor *ḥadīths*; Prophet *ḥadīths*, it follows, are later still. *ḥadīths* with perfect *isnāds* are later than *ḥadīths* with faulty *isnāds*. The *isnād* is the most arbitary part of any *ḥadīth*.[174]

John Burton comments on Schacht's conclusions:

> In common with other scholars, Schacht experienced the *isnād* barrier. The further back one reaches, the more unsatisfactory the *isnād* until it is discovered that, on the basis of the *isnād*, one cannot proceed further back than about the year 100 AH.[175]

To Schacht, legal *ḥadīths* originate only as far back as 100 AH, the final period of Umayyad rule. This is when he has ascertained legal thought to have begun. He does see the use of *isnāds* before this period. According to Schacht, it is not possible to find any authentic tradition among those attributed

---

[173] Schacht, *Origins*, 155-7.
[174] Schacht, *Origins*, 150; 163; 165.
[175] J. Burton, *An Introduction to the Ḥadīth* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), 53.

to the companions either. He argues that authentic legal traditions can only be found among those attributed to the subsequent generation, the generation of successors (*T□b□□□n*).

Some scholars argued that the Goldziher-Schacht theories needed a resurgence, placing further questions upon the course of Islamic history as well as the existence of the Qur□□n as a source of history. This movement was led by John Wansborough. Wansborough's main hypotheses in his works are firstly that different parts of the Qur□□n had their origin in communities such as Iraq or Syria and not in Arabia, these evolving originally from independent Prophetical traditions within a long period of oral tradition, reaching their canonical form in the 2nd century. Secondly, a small part of the traditions were given scriptural status with the rest left as *□ad□th*.[176] Thirdly, the exchange of ideas between Jews, Christians, and Zoroastrians, within a sectarian milieu, was the environment under which these ideas developed. Fourthly, Classical Arabic and grammar, in addition to the rise of Qur□□nic commentary, played a major role in the final Qur□□nic text. Fifthly, Jewish opposition was one of the motivations behind the canonization of the Qur□□n as one can see from its polemic character. Sixthly, Islamic tradition can be described as salvation history, a late haphazard invention of a religion's history, motivated by theology and an evangelical character, which projected back in time to give itself clarity, similar to the canonization of Hebrew scripture. Finally, of the utmost importance, was that 'the reason that no Islamic source material from the 1st century or so of Islam has survived is that it never existed'. Schacht's belief that the Qur□□n was not the basis of law before the 9th century is stated

[176] J. Wansborough, *Qur□□nic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 44.

by Wansborough.[177] Andrew Rippin summarizes the aims of such a movement:

> What the Qur□□n is trying to evidence, what *tafs□r*, *s□rah*, and theological writings are trying to explicate, is how the sequence of worldly events centred on the time of Mu□ammad was directed by God, All the components of Islamic salvation history are meant to witness the same point of faith, namely, an understanding of history that sees God's role in directing the affairs of humankind…..Salvation history comes down to us in a literary form and must be approached by means appropriate to such literary analysis.[178]

Wansborough's scepticism was continued by Crone, Cook and Hinds. These scholars believed that contradictions are rife within the Muslim traditions. Such contradictions are the products of later writers according to them, and are viewed as being of little use in reconstructing the actual events that took place.[179] Crone discusses the idea that, for about a century and a half, Muslim knowledge was transmitted orally. Historical writing may have entered the scene in the late Umayyad period, however, the proper historical works were from the □Ab□ssid period onwards. Crone does not state that oral transmission basically equates to unreliability but that the tradition may go through a period of transformation.[180]

To Crone, Ibn Isḥ□q has been preserved but he remains a great grandchild of Mu□ammad's era, and classical Islam had settled in

---

[177] J. Wansborough, *Qur□□nic Studies,* 44.
[178] A. Rippin, "Literary Analysis of the Qur□□n, *Tafs□r* and *S□rah*: The Methodologies of John Wansborough'' in *Approaches to Islam in Religious Studies*, ed. Richard C. Martin (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1985), 151-63.
[179] Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*; Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph*; and Crone, *Slaves on Horses.*
[180] Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 4.

such a period. Furthermore, Crone views the emergence of Islam as an explosion.[181] Arabs had gone through a major reform, moving from the pagan world and the desert habitat to that of an empire. What Muḥammad envisaged for his people may be somewhat different to what later caliphs had understood:

> In the course of a few decades, the Arabs exchanged their ancestral paganism for monotheism, the desert for a habitation in the settled Middle East, tribal innocence for state structures, poverty for massive wealth, and undisturbed provinciality for exposure to the world's polemical attention. Rarely have a preacher and his followers lived in such discontinuous environments; what made sense to Muḥammad alone made none to Muʿāwiya, let alone to ʿAbd al-Mālik.[182]

Hagarism[183] sought to examine early Islamic history and make sense of discrepancies. The authors viewed the Islamic tradition as being written much later than the events discussed and therefore they sought to 'step outside the Islamic tradition altogether and start again'.[184] Muḥammad is viewed as a messianic figure who used the Abrahamic faiths in tandem with Arab tribalism to lead an exodus to Palestine. The immigrants are, to Crone and Cooke, the descendants of Abraham's wife Hagar who formed a religion by taking beliefs from Christianity and Judaism. Hawting and Calder proposed a similar sceptical attitude to the authenticity of the historical *ḥadīths*.[185]

---

[181] Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 4.
[182] Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 5.
[183] Crone and Cooke, *Hagarism*.
[184] Crone and Cook, *Hagarism*, 3.
[185] Gerald R. Hawting, "The Origins of the Muslim Sanctuary at Mecca", in G.H.A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1982), 23-47, and Norman Calder, "The Qurrā and the Arab Lexicographical Tradition", *JSS*, 36, 2 (1991), 297-307.

Scepticism towards reconstructing Islamic history can also be seen in the works of Hayden White, who argued that when one examines historical works in general, they seem to take the form of a narrative. However, this narrative was a 'coherent and ordered representation of events or developments in sequential time'.[186] White therefore argued that historical conclusions are simply poetic and rhetorical in nature.[187] White's theory of history as narrative has had wider implications, especially in debates concerning historiography. White examined renowned historians and philosophers of history and eventually identified rhetorical styles as well as rhetorical literary genres. His conclusion was clear, historical sources take the reader on a journey but to a destination and conclusion which the author himself had had in mind.[188]

Reactionaries

The views of the sceptic school have been commented on as well as vehemently criticised. The criticism took two important forms. The first was to demonstrate that there were written *ḥadīths* in the time of the Prophet and in the period after. The second was to prove consistency within the *ḥadīths* in the use of the *isnād* system. To Schacht, the *isnād* system revealed discrepancies and fabrications, whereas the reactionist school sought to prove otherwise.

Abbott is viewed as one of the proponents of the reactionary school. An incremental and early written tradition is advocated,

[186] Willie Thompson, *Postmodernism and History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 132.
[187] See Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), ix.
[188] White, *Metahistory*, 309.

using evidence such as papyri fragments from the Umayyad period. She contended that writing *ḥadīths* was an act of the companions of the Prophet and that there was a continuous writing of *ḥadīths* until the period of collection. If *ḥadīths* were written, then these were considered reliable by Abbott.[189] The question arises as to why there was so little in the form of manuscripts in this period. Abbott answers the question by looking at the opinion of the second caliph, ʿUmar, who seemed to fear that Muslims may follow the Jewish and Christian tradition and leave aside the Qurʾān and follow that which was secondary.[190] Companions would fear the narrating and writing of a tradition as she believed it would anger the caliph.[191]

Abbott continues by stating that after this period, narrating and writing *ḥadīths* became an important scholarly task. Mecca and Medīna became centres of the transmission of *ḥadīth* for legal and theological discussion and, by the second half of the 1st century, the usage of *ḥadīth* was mainstream. The Umayyads, Abbott contended, took an interest in the transmission and recording of *ḥadīths*, and disagrees therefore with Goldziher's opinion that their rule was more secular than religious. Furthermore, Ibn Ḥazm's work of recording the *ḥadīth* and the *sunnah* is fully backed by ʿUmar II, thus highlighting the commitment to collecting the *ḥadīths* into canonical form and that extra insinuating circumstances, such as the untimely death of the caliph, the manuscripts did not receive attention.

The increase of *ḥadīth* material was not a sign of fabrication and unreliability for Abbott, in contrast to Schacht. There was

[189] Abbott, *Studies*, vol. 2, 6-7.
[190] Abbott, *Studies*, vol. 2, 10.
[191] Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam*, 18.

now an active organization of lengthy manuscripts, with the chain of narrators provided to give the document its reliability. One family would preserve a document as well as have knowledge of its chain, thereby protecting the reliability of a *ḥadīth*:

> The development of the family *isnād* and continuous written transmission lead to the …inescapable conclusion…that the bulk of the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* as they had developed by about the end of the first century was already written down by someone somewhere, even though comparatively small numbers of memorized traditions were being recited orally.[192]

Abbott attacks Western scholars in the way they understand semantics within the text of *ḥadīth* and the Arabic language. An example is provided which relates to the word *ṣaḥīfah*. Many Western scholars thought the word *ṣaḥīfah* meant a single sheet but this can also refer to a large manuscript. *Akhbār,* a word used within many *ḥadīths,* is another word which Abbott highlights as an example of a word that could be used to denote both oral and written transmission. Furthermore, there is a distinction between public and private uses of written transmission. What was not seen publically, did not deny its private usage. However, the conundrum Abbott places herself in is what then of the fabricated *ḥadīths* considering unsound *ḥadīths* were a majority? Abbott replies by stating that although she may not necessarily believe all that is within the major collections is reliable, it was the *isnād* that was tampered with rather than the *matn* itself.[193]

[192] Abbott, *Studies*, vol. 2, 39.
[193] Abbott, *Studies*, vol. 2, 65-72.

Abbott concluded by stating:

> It would, of course, be absurd to equate oral transmission with excessive fluidity of either form or content, with the usually accompanying implication of conscious or unconscious fabrication, and it would be equally absurd to equate literary record with complete fixity of form and content implying thereby the exclusion of the probability of fabrication. But it would likewise be absurd not to concede that oral transmission is indeed more conducive to fabrication than is literary fixity.[194]

A□am□ and Sezgin reply to Schacht's scepticism by stating that:

> It will be argued that, in broad terms, the writings of the early scholars support the classical picture; Schacht has apparently failed to consult some of the most relevant literature; he often misunderstands the texts he quotes; the examples he uses frequently contradict the point that he is attempting to make; on occasions he quotes out of context; and most important he employs unscientific methodology for his research, thus drawing conclusions that are untenable when the evidence of the text as a whole is weighed.[195]

To Schacht, literary work was widespread at the time of the Prophet, the companions and in subsequent generations, the Umayyads. To demonstrate the point, a list is provided of companions and successors who were active in this period.

A□am□ replies to Schacht by discussing how Schacht as a scholar should be aware of all *□ad□ths* that have been narrated. In this way, what Schacht viewed as an imperative basis for a *□ad□th* was

[194] Abbott, *Studies*, vol. 2, 64.
[195] M. M. A□am□, *On Schacht's Origins of Mu□ammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies; 1996), 3.

dismissed by A□am□. He concludes, therefore, by saying:

> So even if mistakes in *isn□d* and *a□□d□th* exist, Schacht has produced no evidence that would cause us to impugn the good faith of the majority of the transmitters or abandon the *□ad□th* literature.[196]

Within the school of reactionaries are scholars who examine exegetical *□ad□ths* and the origins of *tafs□r*. This examination was viewed as a 'microcosm of the debate surrounding the authenticity of *□ad□th* material'.[197] In this area, there is no manuscript which traces back to the first century of Islam. Therefore, *isn□ds* have to be used and these are to be found within later collections. While certain scholars trust the traditions completely, others tend to conclude that fabrications were abundant.

Tafs□r of the Qur□□n can be summarized in three ways. The first method is that the Qur□□n explains itself by what is within the Qur□□n; one is able to understand which verse is being described literally and which metaphorically, and the contexts are therefore understood. Secondly, understanding would come from the Prophet and thirdly, from the companions and their successors. As Islam began to spread, there became a growing need to explain the Qur□□n, especially to the non-Arabs. The traditions would be narrated and given an *isn□d*.

Both Muslim and Western scholars display confidence in the traditions as well as the *isn□d* system. Heribert Horst, employing a source-critical methodology similar to that of

---

[196] A□am□, *On Schacht*, 182.
[197] Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam,* 65.

Abbott and Sezgīn, examined al-Ṭabarī's *tafsīr*.[198] Horst concludes that manuscripts may have been available to al-Ṭabarī, but not in their complete form. Older commentaries from personalities such as ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭalib may be available, but only parts of the Qurʾān have *isnāds*. These broken *isnāds* may relate to the movement of students between one teacher and another, or to the fact that certain shaykhs limit themselves to particular subjects. Horst concludes that the existence of written exegetical material signifies that al-Ṭabarī's material is more reliable than the legal material in the six major collections.[199]

Harris Birkeland is another of the reactionaries who places great trust on the *isnād* system.[200] Goldziher was of the belief that Qurʾānic *tafsīr* was not encouraged in the early period of Islam. Birkeland's reply is to state that Ibn ʿAbbās, Muḥammad's cousin, practised the analysis of the Qurʾān without any opposition. Birkeland agrees that there may have been a period of opposition to *tafsīr*, but in contrast to the chronology provided by Goldziher. Furthermore, the more groups which would emerge laying claim to their own *tafsīr*, the greater the need for a standpoint on the principles of Islamic thought.

In discussing those *ḥadīths* which al-Ṭabarī traces back to the Prophet, and why there were so few of them, Birkeland states:

> The great bulk of them has as older authorities men living about

[198] Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam,* 66, examines Heribert Horst's *Die Gewahrsmanner im korankommentar at-Ṭabarī: Ein Beitrag zur kenntnis der exegetischen Uberlieferung im Islam* (Rheinische Friedrich-Willhelms-Universitat zu Bonn, Ph.D dissertation, 1951).
[199] Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam,* 68.
[200] H. Birkeland, *Old Muslim Opposition Against Interpretation of the Qurʾān* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1955).

> 100 AH. These men were not generally believed by circles rejecting *tafsīr* when they tried to trace a tradition of exegetical contents back to the Prophet or a companion. So they had to function as their own authorities, when they were not able to demonstrate their direct transmission from Ibn ʿAbbās.[201]

Furthermore, an argument is advanced that *ʾaḥādīths* which do not end with Ibn ʿAbbās are to be taken as genuine. This is in contrast to the the *isnād* when extended backwards:

> It cannot be doubted that an *isnād* very often secondarily was prolonged backwards. In such a case it remains a problem why all *isnāds* leading to disciples of Ibn ʿAbbās were not prolonged backwards to the latter himself. His name cannot possibly have been omitted secondarily. We consequently are able to conclude with absolute certainty that the name of Ibn ʿAbbās did not originally belong to the *isnāds* in which it is not found in at-Ṭabarī. In other words; the *isnāds* stopping at a stage later than Ibn ʿAbbās must originate from a time when a companion or even a successor was not required to authenticate an exegetical information. A further conclusion to be drawn is that exegetical *isnāds* occurring in at-Ṭabarī and stopping at a later date most probably are older than those traced back to Ibn ʿAbbās, another companion, or the Prophet.[202]

Moderates

The views of both the sceptics and reactionaries are both revered, understood and, in many cases, justified. However, a group of scholars emerge who take a middle ground.[203] They do not fully accept the doubts and uncertainty which have been caused

[201] Birkeland, *Old Muslim Opposition Against Interpretation of the Qurʾān*, 11.
[202] Birkeland, *Old Muslim Opposition Against Interpretation of the Qur'ān*, 36.
[203] Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam,* 26.

by the sceptics and at the same time are not willing to fully accept the version of clear and continuous history of tradition from the reactionaries. G.H.A. Juynboll is an example of a scholar of *ḥadīth* who both agrees and disagrees with the school of Schacht and the reactionaries as well. He describes this evolution in thought:

> When, in the mid-sixties, I wrote my study on modern Muslim discussions about the authenticity of the *ḥadīth* literature, I realized that I did not take sides, neither in the disputes among Oriental scholars nor in the ones occasionally flaring up between Western and Oriental scholars. I had been influenced by the books of Goldziher and Schacht, of course, but also by those of modern Muslim scholars, and I kept postponing my commitment to any particular point of view. Initially I though of the problems raised by Oriental and Western scholars concerning the origins of *ḥadīth* as mutually irreconcilable. If two points of view could differ so widely, how could anyone even attempt to bring them into harmony. Then in 1976, I embarked on an examination of the role early Muslim *quṣṣāṣ* were supposed to have played in the spreading of traditions. My pre-conceived ideas about the outcome of my investigation were shattered.[204]

His admiration for Schacht is evident:

> However much I admire Schacht's *Origins* - I have in particular benefited from his theories that *isnāds* have a tendency to grow backwards and his common link theory - because of its countless cross-references it also makes heavy reading and its style seems to rub many readers, Western and Muslim, up the wrong way.[205]

To Juynboll, the *isnād* system had come later than the emergence

[204] Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition*, Introduction.
[205] Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition*, 3-4.

of the growth of *ḥadīths*, and therefore was not able to examine the material available:

> It seems likely at least part of the Prophetic tradition listed in one or more canonical - or even non-canonical - collections deserves to be considered as a fair representation of what the Prophet of Islam did or said, or might have done or said, but surely it is unlikely that they will ever find even a moderately successful method of proving with incontrovertible certainty the historicity of the ascription of such to the Prophet but in a few isolated instances.[206]

Gregor Schoeler is another scholar who is in the middle ground. His main discussion centres on the oral vs. written debate. To Schoeler:

> the various views which were adopted on this issue were irreconcilable; the discussion had reached an impasse. The solution seemed to me to be found in a statement which the Austrian Arabist Alois Sprenger had already made in the nineteenth century; we must distinguish between notes intended as aide-memoire, lecture notes and published books.[207]

Schoeler argued that written texts were available before Bukhārī and Muslim's canonical works. Students would transcribe the words of their teachers and therefore preserved the knowledge that was imparted to them. Certain scholars would have their work written by students, such as Mālik b. Anas:

> Of Mālik ibn Anas, we hear that he preferred to have his *Kitāb al-Muwaṭṭa* read to him by his students. Sometimes he recited it

[206] Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition*, 71.
[207] G. Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, Preface.

> himself. Occasionally, he is even reported to have issued a copy revised by himself for transmission. This means that he undoubtedly produced written versions or had them written out by scribes.[208]

For Schoeler, that which is oral and that which is written work and develop simultaneously rather than exclusive of one another. Furthermore, Motzki seeks to show that the narratives of the early history are consistent, and that they may even date back further than what is commonly thought. He makes clear the dilemma of such a study:

> On the one hand, it is not possible to write a historical biography of the Prophet without being accused of using the sources uncritically, while on the other hand, when using the sources critically, it is simply not possible to write such a biography.[209]

Many scholars continue to debate between the school of the reactionaries and that of the sceptics. Robson, as an example, while agreeing with Schacht, also states that his argument may also be 'too sweeping'.[210] He views the first usage of *isnād* from the last third of the 1st century and the revolt of ʿAbdallāh b. Zubayr. There is a mixture of the 'genuine and the spurious' material according to Robson within the development of the *ḥadīth* materials.[211] Coulson differs with Schacht in a number of areas, especially in the close relationship advocated between the development of *ḥadīth* and the development of law.[212] Rubin

---

[208] Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam,* 33.
[209] H. Motzki, *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), xiv.
[210] J. Robson, "The *Isnād* in Muslim Tradition'', *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society,* 15 (1953-4), 15-26.
[211] Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam*, 40.
[212] N.J. Coulson, *A History of Islamic Law*, *Islamic Surveys,* vol. 2 (Edinburgh:

tends to side with the sceptics. The Muḥammad that is described is by a community devoted to him, who would want to describe him in the way they would have viewed the texts they 'created, preserved, and circulated through the ages'.[213] Furthermore, Johann Fück examines the argument of the age of the narrator. In contrast to the argument set that a youthful narrator is less reliable, Fück states that youth is a sign of reliability because older companions would have been more logical in giving a narration credibility. Ibn ʿAbbās and Abū Hurayrah make the *ḥadīth* stronger when they are in a chain rather than weaker.[214]

Certain themes are continually discussed and become the basis of the history of many communal groups or individual interests. Noth, as an example, divided themes in history into two groups, primary and secondary. Noth wanted history to be understood in as precise way as possible through primary means. The primary resource is the original sources, discussed in line with the event and its happenings, in contrast with the secondary works which, in many cases, are reflections of the thoughts of the transmitter in question. Primary themes included *futūḥ* (conquests), *riddah* (apostacy) and *fitnah* (sedition). Secondary themes include *ghārāt* (raids), dates according to Hijra and arrangements according to caliphates. This does not deny that a primary work may become a secondary discussion through the evolution of time.

Repetition of events is seen by the authors as the base of their

---

Edinburgh University Press, 1964; reprint, 1991), 65.
[213] Uri Rubin, "The Eye of the Beholder: The Life of Muḥammad As Viewed By the Early Muslims, A Textual Analysis", *Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam*, 8 (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1995), 3.
[214] Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam*, 39, translates Johann Fück's "Die Rolle des Traditionalismus im Islam'', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft,* 93 (1939), 17.

scepticism. They look at the problem of *topoi* in the early chronicles, divided their examination into three sections; personal names, those emphasizing feats of arms and those which serve to glorify former times. The authors see that the borrowing of a motif for use in another narration does not mean that the event did not actually happen but makes it less reliable.[215] The authors examine the Battle of the Bridge in 634, and the role of the *topos* in being a basis for the way latter narrations were explained. The usage of a river scene is viewed by the authors as an instance of repetition, not only of this incident but also by the usage of the scene where Saul crosses the river with his soldiers in 2:249 of the Qur□□n:[216]

> And when Saul set out with the army, he said: "Verily All□h will try you by a river, whoever drinks from it , then he is not of me, and whoever does not taste of it, then verily he is of me, save he who takes drinks with his hand as much of it as fills the hollow of his hand.'' But they drank from it save a few of them, and when he and those who believed with him crossed it, they said: "We have no strength today against J□l□t and his hosts.en he is not of me, and whoever does noall meet All□h said: "How often, by All□h's permission, has a small army vanquished a mighty host; and All□h is with the patient."

Furthermore, in another heading, '*Topoi* that Glorify Former Times', the authors seek to present history being written with a political purpose by showing how caliphs are thought to have carefully planned conquests, and that these movements were not by chance.[217]

---

[215] A. Noth and L. Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source-Critical Study* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1994),109.
[216] Noth and Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition,* 135.
[217] Noth and Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition,* 138.

However, to state that such repetition highlights weakness in narration is viewed sceptically by ʿayeb el-ʿibrī:

> These phrases do not always have to be fabricated because they are formulae of expression that are likely to have been uttered in various military contexts, and were borrowed for further usage for generations. Even more stretched is the author's assertion that the slogan *Allāhu Akbār* shouted by Muslims before battle is a *topos* because it appears in too many battles on the Byzantine and Sassanian fronts. Again, we are here dealing with a religious phrase, not unlikely in the discourse of an army of religious conquest, which cannot be viewed as a one time occurrence that later dropped out of usage but was appropriate by tridents only.[218]

In looking at the repetition of major themes, el-ʿibrī again points out that such an argument will never be fully accepted:

> Repetition by itself cannot be used as a yardstick for judging the veracity of a report. Repetition can occur because certain formulae of expression get coined from time to time and are borrowed in a standard way afterwards, while actors may often be found adopting patterns of behaviour that imitate the actions of individuals idealized either because of their beliefs, achievements or charismatic importance.[219]

Furthermore, Franz Rosenthal produced a number of works that examined the area of Islamic history and historiography including *The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship* and *A History of Muslim Historiography*. The author seeks to present developments in literary forms of historical analysis with an aim of understanding the basic issues of Muslim historiography.

---

[218] ʿ. el-ʿibrī, *JSTOR*, vol. 118, n.1, 116.
[219] Noth and Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition*.

The main analysis in the *History of Muslim Historiography* is Arabic historiography, in contrast to the papers of historians such as Wustenfeld and Margoliouth, which were seen as being more broad and up to date. Although the study has certain limitations, a clear picture is provided until the period of the 15th century.

Although divided into three parts,[220] it is the first part of the book that concentrates on the discussions within historiography. Topics such as the conception of history within Arabia, the position of Muḥammad as well as the Muslim historian are all discussed. Furthermore, there is the important discussion on the differences between *Khabar* and *Tārīkh*.[221] *Ṭabaqāt* works are also discussed. When looking at Islamic content, there is a focus on studies such as biography, genealogy, cosmography and astrology as well as an important look at the usage of coins and inscriptions in understanding the development of history.

A problem that arises when discussing works which focus on certain themes is how does one pinpoint exactly whether or not a certain theme was discussed in earlier Islamic circles or because of later transmitters. There is an understanding that certain works in Islamic history may have been burnt or, indeed, lost. These works may have had some of the hotly discussed topics, such as Prophethood or leadership, entrenched within them. To state that the discussion of a certain topic began late is to discount completely the possibility that the earliest

---

[220] F. Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography*, 2nd revised edition (Leiden: Brill, 1968).
[221] Stefan Leder, "The Literary Use of the *Khabar*: A Basic Form of Historical Writing", in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East I: Problems in the Literary Source Material*, ed. Averil Cameron and Lawrence I. Conrad (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1992), 277-315.

narrators may have spoken of it.

Therefore, Prophethood may have been spoken of as early as the 1st century but the records are not necessarily present. Furthermore, the early believers seemed to be more concerned with being a reflection of Mu□ammad's teachings than writing what he taught. Writing about Prophethood emerges at a time when Muslims sought to make themselves distinct from their Christian and Jewish counterparts, with narrations concerning the miracles of the young Mu□ammad as well as the fact that, in the world of pagans, he remained a pure man.

The more theological debates which the Muslims found themselves in, the more the need to write about what differentiated Islam as a religion. The opposition had very powerful sources that they used in their discussions, and so came a period where the Muslims would write what they had already known of the knowledge left behind by Mu□ammad. Many believers began to employ the method of the Qur□□n as a source of historical narrative. They would see the way the Qur□□n would use anecdotes and words of the Prophets preceding Mu□ammad and they began to write what they had seen of Mu□ammad in a similar fashion. However, not all the material thought of as being from the 1st century was necessarily reliable. The *Isr□□□l□y□t* works, although they concern issues raised within theological debate, were from the hands of people such as Ka'b al-A□b□r, of Jewish-Yemeni origin. His writing on Adam and Eve at times was more biblical than Qur□□nic. Wahb b. Munabbih also compiled a collection of *Isr□□□l□y□t* .[222]

[222] Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri*, vol. 1, 36.

Approaches to Islamic History

Amongst the approaches used in modern scholarship was what Donner viewed as the descriptive approach.[223] The approach was somewhat simple, using Islamic sources to build a picture of Islamic history. Some may see this as contrasting with modern scholarship, but its approach was fresh:

> It represented a decisive advance in historical method over the kind of anti-Islamic polemic that had dominated Western writing about Islam from the Middle Ages until the eighteenth century, and which had generally shown no interest in examining what Muslim sources said.[224]

This approach to Islamic history placed the Qur□□n as a very important source for the early years of Islam. It recognized that the Qur□□n had chapters devoted to many of the events of early Islamic history. As an example, Chapter 33 of the Qur□□n is called *The Confederates*, providing an understanding of the tribes that opposed Mu□ammad. Chapter 63 is called *The Hypocrites* after the enemies that surrounded Mu□ammad. Chapter 48, *The Victory*, examined the opening of Mecca. Those who conformed to this school argued that there was enough evidence within the Qur□□n. This evidence was supplemented by copious reports, known as *akhb□r*. However, it viewed the *□ad□th* literature as useful for the development of one's piety rather than the reconstruction of history, in opposition to Western scholarship where *□ad□th* science is viewed highly. Many surveys have looked at Islamic history in a descriptive way. For

[223] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 5.
[224] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 5.

example, Muir's *The Caliphate: Its Rise, Decline and Fall*[225] or Hugh Kennedy's *Mohammad and the Age of the Caliphates*[226] fall into this category.

This approach was scrutinized when many of the renowned Arabic works were printed rather than stored in manuscripts. These manuscripts had become known to Westerners during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and then printed. There was then a movement to examine great works, such as *Futūḥ al Buldān* of al-Balādhurī[227] as well al-Ṭabarī's *Tārīkh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk.*[228] The moment these works came to the fore, modern scholarship looked at many parts of Islamic history in a different light. Contradictions were clear. Political affiliations as well as story-telling were particularly scrutinized. Furthermore, many of the early Islamic texts mention the reading of the Qurʾān as being incumbent upon every Muslim male and female, therefore implying its presence in the time of Muḥammad.

One only has to view the way Muḥammad is portrayed in the Qurʾān, and then in the *Ḥadīth,* to understand that their developments had a different base. Muḥammad is discussed in the Qurʾān, but in the shadow of Moses, Abraham and Noah. Furthermore, topics such as monotheism and the Day of Judgment serve as the pillars of discussion within the Qurʾān. On the other hand, when one examines the *Ḥadīths*, Muḥammad is the centre of all statements. He explains all that has come before him, and his companions, through a chain narrated about his

---

[225] W. Muir, *The Caliphate: Its Rise, Decline and Fall* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1891).
[226] Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates*.
[227] Aḥmed b. Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1996).
[228] Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarīr b.Yazīd al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*, 13 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1998).

life, statements and movements. The Qur□□n tries to show Mu□ammad on many occasions as a normal man with a heavenly message, eating what the people ate, and walking in their streets, whereas in the corpus of *□ad□th*, he is a miracle worker, covered by clouds, trees bowing to him, unlawful food falling before him, possessing the miracles of all those before him.

The source-critical approach to events compares the sources at hand in a method not too dissimilar to European historiography. Why was there a contradiction? Was this because reliable material was too regularly mixed with the unreliable? But what did unreliable mean? To some it meant the words of storytellers, to others a piece of history that had some truth but was later distorted, and finally, to others, unreliable meant that what was written had a political motive. However, the source-critical approach did as much as it could to use independent works, such as those of the Greeks, to examine early Arab and Islamic history. Wellhausen, for example, proposed that 'schools' now had to be examined to understand the basis of a narration or an event in Islamic history.[229] The school of Med□na was different from that of the school of K□fah, which may have been somewhat different from the school of Syria. Many of the civil wars, including Jamal, □iff□n, Riddah and Nahraw□n were examined now through the usage of 'good' and 'bad' sources. The reality of this approach is that it allowed historians to question the motive of a narration and whether political influence played a role in who was praised and who was attacked.

Another approach which could be seen was the traditional-

[229] J. Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and its Fall*, tr. Margaret Weir (Beirut: Khayats, 1963).

critical approach. When Goldziher published his study on *Ḥadīth*, the question of oral tradition came to the fore. He was arguably the first Western author to look at *Ḥadīth* through the context of social and political movements. Many *Ḥadīths* were questioned, although the chains were present, for indeed when he was able to show that a *Ḥadīth* with a strong chain was clearly contradictory to another, he could continue to question every narration. The question as to the length of time that narrations were transmitted orally was studied by many. Abbott, for example, contended that there were already compilations by the end of the 1st century. Her opinion came through extensive research using a known source of evidence, that being Arabic papyri.[230] Motzki is of the belief that oral and written tradition were both prevalent as early as the 1st century through an analysis of Meccan tradition.[231]

Madelung disagrees with the lack of trust shown towards earlier sources, especially in doing justice to settling conflict of early history:

> The question of the caliphate is too intricately tied to much of the internal history of the early Muslim community to be discussed without a solid understanding of that history based on more than abstract speculation. Work with the narrative sources, both those that have been available to historians for a long time and others which have been published recently, made it plain that their wholesale rejection as late fiction is unjustified and that with a judicious use of them a much more reliable and accurate portrait of the period can be draw than has so far been realized.[232]

[230] Abbott, *Studies,* vol. 1, 26.
[231] H. Motzki, *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).
[232] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, xi.

Madelung is one of those historians for whom both the Qur□□n and the *□ad□th* are vital texts in understanding the earlier period. The sub-section of his work includes a section entitled, "The Obligations of Kinship and the Families of the Prophets in the Qur□□n".[233] His work reflects the wealth of information in a wide variety of Arabic texts. While not all reports are seen as authentic, they are seen as being reliable, reports of contemporaries against one another. Sources are used from all schools of Islamic thought. In a field where a sceptical attitude is at the helm, Madelung makes clear that sceptical scholarship is to be easily dismissed.[234] He reconstructs the personal rivalries and conspiracies that plagued this period through all the sources at hand.

As Lewinstein[235] describes:

> The author's mastery of the texts is on display throughout; Madelung gives us a narrative history of the period which brings to life the characters, anecdotes and speeches found in the classical sources but rarely put before readers anymore.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have sought to examine the different approaches to the study of the classical texts. We examined the arguments of the sceptic school, and the replies given by the reactionaries and the moderates. While it is clear that the sceptics cannot easily be refuted, there are certain weaknesses with their stance. Of the utmost importance is that, unlike

[233] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 6.
[234] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, xi.
[235] K. Lewinstein, *JAOS,* 121, 2 (Apr., 2001), 326-327.

Wellhausen in his source-critical approach, Noth believed that the 'theory of the schools' was weak. Noth felt that the methods used by all these schools, be they from Medīna or Kūfah, were predominantly the same. Taking a narrative and concluding its reliability on the basis of the school was something rejected by Noth outright.[236] Islamic history can be reconstructed. We take the position of Sezgin when he states that the writing was both early and continuous, beginning with the *ṣaḥīfahs* and culminating in the first collection of al-Zuhrī:

> Now we must come closer to the fact that these transmission methods reach back in part to the beginning of Islam and that they demonstrate, with the help from references and preserved materials, that from the start exclusively written foundations for the transmission were involved and that the names of the authors are contained in the *isnāds*.[237]

While it is true that there are contradictions and differences of thought within Islamic history, the reality remains that this has been the norm since the earliest years. We agree with Donner when he states:

> because there was no central person or institution with generally recognized authority to promulgate what constituted "official'' doctrine, the situation within the Islamic community at large might be best described as one of multiple orthodoxies, rather than simply of an established orthodox and several heterodox or heretical positions. Yet the fact remains that on most central features of the traditional origins story, these different orthodoxies show marked agreement, a fact that the sceptical

[236] Noth and Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition.*
[237] F. Sezgīn, *Geschichte des Arabesque Schriftums*, *Band I: Qur'ān Wissenschaften, Ḥadīth, Geschichte, Fiqh, Dogmatik, Mystik bis ca. 430 AH,* tr. H. Berg (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), 22.

school never addresses.[238]

Furthermore, in reply to the sceptics, after Mu□ammad there was no leader-type figure who could enforce who was right or wrong. Each group took its own leader as an authority to the extent that, in the period of the K□fan jurisprudent Ab□ Hanifah, there were many scholars who held different jurisprudential and theological opinions. Although this fact probably raises the question of why such a leadership was not clearly ordained in the way Prophethood was, the reality was that an enforced respected figure as Mu□ammad, in many cases, was rarely seen. Indeed, Donner maintained that such differences do indeed exist and will continue to exist:

> There is little reason to think, therefore, that significant opinions and debates relating to Islamic origins have died out so completely that no echo of them can be identified in the sources. Indeed on *a priori* grounds it might be seen as just as plausible to assert virtually the opposite of the sceptics position; that in anybody of traditional material that is as massive and was cast into written form as early as the Muslim narratives on Islamic origins, some vestige of all significant opinions and events will survive, much as the surface scattering of potsherds on an archeological tell will include not only pottery from the latest occupations, but from all previous ones, as well.[239]

The issue of Mu□□wiya's leadership, therefore, is a clear example of the reasoning behind the development of the writing of Islamic history. While some may argue that the community intrinsically had an inclination to write so as to preserve the message of Islam, the themes that emerge in the evolution of

[238] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 27.
[239] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 28.

Islamic historical writing indicate a search for identity and legitimacy in the early community. While it is clear that each view differs politically and theologically, the theme allows us to understand the outline of the issues that dominated the early period. Mu□□wiya's leadership is central to these theological and political debates concerning leadership. While there are disagreements within the narratives, they are disagreements that concern the interpretation of a particular incident, not the incident itself.

While one may argue that there are contradictions, at the same time some of the most controversial speeches, debates, stands and discussions are all recovered. Each of these can be used to examine the biographies of the prominent personalities in the formative period of the Islamic polity. To say that history has been lost is sidestepping many of these clear narrations. Furthermore, this study will use an inter-textual approach to studying the renowned figures of both Islamic and non-Islamic history. The theory of inter-textuality was introduced by Julia Kristeva. Primarily, inter-textuality is associated with post-structuralist theorists. When examining texts, Kristeva argued for the notion of two axes - a horizontal axis which would form a connection between the author and the reader and a vertical axis which would connect the text to other texts.[240] When uniting these two axes, shared codes emerge. These shared codes are vital in seeking to depict an understanding of the caliphate of Mu□□wiya . Kristeva argued that 'every text from the outset is under the jurisdiction of other discourses which impose a universe on it'.[241] Roland Barthes, when discussing inter-

[240] Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 69.
[241] Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), 105.

textuality, further developed the theory by stating that the meaning of a text is not only found in the text, but is produced by the reader when they place it alongside the complex network of texts in the reading process.[242] The inter-textual approach will examine the personality of Mu□□wiya by employing not only historical literature, whose authenticity and reliability has been verified by Abbott, Donner and Sezgin, but by also opening the study to different genres of literature. This will clearly be seen in the forthcoming chapters when conducting a survey of the different genres of literature from this period. Historical, theological, jurisprudential and belles-lettres literature will all be deployed, using the inter-textual approach, to gain a more thorough understanding and to examine the caliphate of Mu□□wiya b. Ab□ Sufy□n.

Chapter 2

Sources

This chapter will seek to conduct a survey of a range of literary sources from the 3rd to the 6th centuries AH/9th to the 12th centuries CE. Historical, theological, jurisprudential and belles-lettres literature form the basis of the narratives

[242] See *The Pleasure of the Text* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1975).

relating to the period in and around the caliphate of Mu□□wiya and provide adequate evidence that the theory of the schools can be rejected and that through source criticism, similarities as well as contradictions in narratives display no clear political and ideological motive in their compilation. The first school was of the belief that when surveying the sources, it is vital for the reader to take note of the □Abb□sid government and their influence on the way in which certain characters and their rule are portrayed, most notably that of □Al□ b. Ab□ □□lib. Wellhausen and Noeldeke saw a union of politico-religious Sh□□□ and pro-□Abb□sid interest coming together. The second view, that of de Goeje and Mednikov, sought to rehabilitate the position of the Umayyads by stating that the renowned early compilations written during □Abb□sid rule between 750 AH and 850 AH, would 'work out these historical perspectives and then use them as the basis for their evaluation of the sources'.[243] They then concluded that there was now an □Ir□q□ school of traditions, headed by collectors such as Ab□ Mikhnaf (d. 157/774) and Sayf b. □Umar (d. 180/796) who they tended to reject in contrast to the Med□nan school of collectors such as Ibn Is□□q (d. 151/761) and al-W□qid□ (d. 207/823). The opinions stating that two schools emerge when surveying the sources of this period is rejected.

Furthermore, the belief that the issue of the legitimacy of the caliph, his authority and the scope of this authority arose after the civil wars is also open to criticism. The collections of historical narrative and theological treatises discuss the subject of leadership becoming an issue days after Mu□ammad had died, at Saq□fah, in a problem that arose between Ab□ Bakr and

[243] Noth and Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition,* 4.

□Al□. Moreover, the excellence and precedence material in *adab* literature discusses the merits of the candidates who should be the first of the caliphs and not simply the fourth as most would portray. Moreover, these sources help us depict a historiographical understanding of Mu□□wiya□s leadership. This study will seek to examine the caliphate of Mu□□wiya through sampling a range of sources, namely historical, theological, jurisprudential and belles-lettres literature using the inter-textual approach in contrast to previous studies on Mu□□wiya which have only focused on historical sources.

These sources are quite late in comparison to Mu□□wiya's period of rule due to the fact that there are very few contemporary sources. This thesis seeks to make sense of how the sources depict Mu□□wiya in terms of how the classical Islamic tradition is formed. Therefore, the thesis will not attempt to provide an irrefutable conclusion concerning Mu□□wiya's character but rather seeks to use the sources and the inter-textual approach to portray how later sources and subsequent tradition interpreted Mu□□wiya's period of rule. These later sources are taken from a period of much discussion and debate - that of the 3rd to the 6th century - a period where dialogue would take place concerning leadership in Islam generally and its relation to the formative years of the religion. The thesis intends to discuss how different traditions, rather than simply historical ones, sought to interpret Mu□□wiya's rule. Previous studies on Mu□□wiya focused on using historical sources to analyse Mu□□wiya's leadership. These sources, in many cases, have the word *'tar□kh'* within the title, such as that of al-□abar□, and would therefore be classified under the genre of historical literature. It is not within the scope of the thesis to cover every work in the different genres of literature written during

the period. This thesis will, however, examine a sample of *adab,* jurisprudential and theological literature from within this period with the primary aim being the representation of Mu□□wiya from more than one genre of literature. For example, while the scholars of *□ad□th* in the 2nd or 3rd century were concerned with gathering material to serve the religion and incorporate these materials within the belief system, the *adab* scholar would be concerned in gathering this material for themselves whilst the *ad□b* would search for all types of knowledge. Jurisprudential texts during this period, such as the *Muṣannaf* of □Abd al-Razz□q, can be seen as a compilation of texts from older works which varied in size, which would provide an understanding of the legal debates during Mu□□wiya's period of rule. These older discussions can be reconstructed from the chains of narrators. His grand text would be seen as amongst the oldest compilation of legal texts. Future studies could look to further the scope of the literature within each genre, in order to shed more light on the portrayal of Mu□□wiya in later tradition.[244]

Belles-Lettres

The word *adab* is translated as belles-lettres in many European histories of Arabic literature. Kh□lid□ is of the opinion that the Greek word '*paideia*' is a better translation for it refers to a process of moral and intellectual education designed to produce an *ad□b*, a gentleman scholar, and is thus immediately

[244] Future studies could examine texts from this periods such as such as 1) Ab□ Y□suf Ya□q□b, *Kit□b al-Khar□j* (1886); Ya□y□ b. Adam al-Qurash□ (d. 203/818), *Kit□b al-Khar□j*, ed. Th. W. Juynboll (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1896); and Ab□ □Ubayd Q□sim b. Sall□m, *Kit□b al-Amw□l (*al-Q□hirah: D□r al-Fikr, 1975); 2) Aḥmad b. □Alī al-Rāzī al-Jaṣṣāṣ, *Uṣ□l al-fiqh al-musamm□ bi al-Fuṣūl fī al-uṣ□l,* 4 vols., ed. U.J. Nashm□ (Kuwait: Wiz□rat al-Awq□f, 1994); M□lik b. Anas, *Muwaṭṭa□ al-Im□m M□lik b. Anas* (Jeddah: D□r al-Shur□q, 1985).

connected with the formation of both intellect and character.[245] Belles-lettres may easily be applied to secular knowledge such as philology, grammar, poetry and the natural sciences. While the scholars of *ḥadīth* in the 2nd or 3rd century would be concerned with gathering material to serve the religion and incorporate these materials within the belief system, the *adab* scholar would be concerned in gathering this material solely for themselves.[246] 'Where a *muḥaddith* would be likely to regard Islam as a complete and completed cultural system, an *adīb* would be more likely to regard Islam as a cultural beginning, a constant invitation to examine the world of nature'.[247] The *adīb* would search for all types of knowledge.[248]

In the Umayyad period, knowledge of the antiquities of Arabia and of other nations returned to the fore after having been forsaken for a more Islamic and ordered way of life. The Umayyads, however, sought to be patrons of antiquities and wanted scholars who had knowledge of such areas. Muʿāwiya in particular was fond of different types of knowledge in preference to the *ʿilm* which was increasingly reduced to Qurʾānic exegesis and jurisprudence. He wanted to know of the world of kings and politicians, as narrated by the late ʿAbbāsid source:

> For the first third of the night, Muʿāwiya would occupy himself with the history and the *Ayyām* of the Arabs…retired to sleep for

[245] Khālidī, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 83.
[246] B. Gruendler, "Verse and Taxes: The Function of Poetry in Selected Literary *Akhbār* of the Third/Ninth Century" in *On Fiction and Adab in Medieval Arabic Literature*, ed. Ph. F. Kennedy (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), 85-124.
[247] Khālidī, *Arabic Historical Thought,* 85.
[248] Ira M. Lapidus, "Knowledge, Virtue, and Action: The Classical Muslim Conception of *Adab* and the Nature of Religious Fulfillment in Islam" in *Moral Conduct and Authority: The Place of Adab in South Asian Islam*, ed. Barbara D. Metcalf (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 39–61.

> the second third, then rose and settled down, ordered that the volumes containing the lives and histories of kings and their wars and stratagems be brought to him and have them read to him by servants specially assigned to do so and entrusted to memorize and recite them. Thus, each night, he could listen to a series of reports, life histories, tales of the past and all kinds of political precepts.[249]

Mu□□wiya wanted to achieve dynastic rule and consolidate his power as head of state. One notices the emergence of the *ad□b* within Umayyad society at this time. These were people who could manipulate political rhetoric as well as act as royal propagandists; 'poets, state secretaries, learned courtiers and even religious scholars, who could be prevailed upon to shed their suspicion of autocracy and to defend dynastic rule'.[250] Arguably the greatest political transformation was undertaken under □Abd al-M□lik.[251] There was a rise in new classes of bureacrats, innovative secretarial styles and a revamp of the bureaucratic structure.

Tensions would bring about competitive arguments as well as subtle rhetoric devices, which an *ad□b* would be passionate about examining. In some cases, the *ad□b* would be seen as the proponent of *j□hil□* thought more than Islamic. This would help in the restructuring of the Arabian tribes, which arguably was an issue of the utmost importance in Mu□□wiya's rule in particular and the Umayyad's in general. The aim was to re-establish relationships which had begun before Islam. In some cases, an *ad□b* would laud the way of life of *j□hil□yyah* over

---

[249] □Al□ b. al-□usayn al-Masʿ□d□, *Mur□j al-Dhah□b wa Ma□□din al-Jawhar*, ed. C. Pellat (Beirut: Université Libanaise, 1966-79), vol. 3, 222.
[250] Kh□lid□, *Arab Historical Thought,* 84.
[251] C. Robinson, *□Abd al-M□lik: Makers of the Muslim World* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2007).

that of Islam. The Arabs were reminded of their language and their culture and their *jāhilī* ways were not attacked; as when al-Aṣma□□ would speak of the beauty of the *jāhilī* spirit:

> If you were to lead poetry into the path of virtue, you would enfeeble it. Do you not see how □asan b. Thabit had attained eminence in the *jāhilīyyah* and Islam but when poetry followed the path of virtue, as in the poetry he composed on the Prophet, □amzah, Ja□far and others, his verse became feeble. The path of poetry is the path of studs, of poets like □Imr□l Qays, Zuhayr and N□bighah, who sing of encampment and departures, defamation and panegyric, flirtation with women, the wild ass and the horse, war and glory.[252]

It was the Greek and Persian *ad□bs* who would ensure that the Umayyad's were able to adapt to the 'imperial rhythms of government'.[253] The fact that they had no tribal affilation meant they were easier to employ and eventually work with, as expressed by □Ubaydull□h b. Ziy□d, the Umayyad governor of Iraq, 'If I employed an Arab as a tax collector and he embezzled the land tax and I punished him, I risked antagonizing his tribe. If I fined him, deducting the fine from the pension of his clan, I did them harm. If I dropped the matter I would be wasting God□s money…I found therefore that the *dihq□ns* (Persian gentry) were more knowledgeable about tax collection, more honest with their trust and easier for me to call to account'.[254]

Two of the most renowned scholars of belles-lettres were al-J□□i□ and al-Taw□□d□.

---

[252] Abī □Ubayd Allah Muḥammad b. □Imrān b. Mūs□ al-Marzub□n□, *al-Muwashshah* (Cairo, 1924), 62.
[253] Kh□lid□, *Arab Historical Thought*, 89.
[254] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, ed. I. □Abb□s (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979), vol. 4/2, 109.

Al-J□□i□

Ab□ □Uthm□n □Amr b. Ba□r al-Fukaym□ al-Ba□r□, known as al-J□□i□, was born in Ba□ra in 160 AH and was originally of Abyssinian origin. Al-J□□i□ refers to a malformation of the eyes.[255] His ugliness would later become proverbial and would be used in a number of anecdotes. Ban□ Fuqaim was a branch of Ban□ Kin□nah and hence he would view himself as a member of the Arab community. His childhood, of which there is little known, included attending Qur□□n classes in the Ban□ Kin□nah quarter. Three names emerge who laid the foundation for his Arabic education; the famous philologists and scholars Ab□ □Ubaidah, al-A□ma□□ and Ab□ Zayd al-An□□r□. He studied theology under the guidance of Thum□ma b. Ashras and al-Na□□□m and *□ad□th* under Ab□ Yus□f al-Q□□□.[256] The two dominant influences on his thought were *adab* and Mu□tazila theology.[257] Arabs were questioning the position of non-Arabs within the state. Furthermore, the question of the caliphate and Im□mate was also a major dilemma, with Sh□□□s questioning □Abb□sid rule and the Umayyads labelling the □Abb□sids as usurpers.

Al-J□□i□ would write on a wide variety of subjects and was known for making fundamental contributions to the important issues that were debated at the time. He was very much interested in aspects of historical understanding and argumentation although he never wrote any works on history. He was able to analyse a

[255] *Enyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, vol. 2, 385a.
[256] C. Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□: Translation of Selected Texts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 2.
[257] T. Kh□lid□, *Arab Historical Thought*, 104.

given subject in the most easily comprehensible way.[258]

Amongst the most important subjects of the time that was being discussed involved religion and politics. The Mu□tazila were examining the reconciliation of faith and reason. The five principles, often referred to as the main Mu□tazila theological position, had already been developed in the time of al-J□□i□. When examining al-J□□i□'s exploration of nature, *adab* and Mu□tazil□s were united with each other. His scathing comments on these scholars and their scholarship would often include the words 'experience' (*tajribah*), 'test' (*imti□□n*) and 'proof' (*burh□n*) and he would become known as a polemicist and a critic. When he examined historiography, he discussed some of the basic conceptual problems that may arise:

> I shall discuss historical reports (*akhb□r*) and describe religious traditions (*ath□r*). I shall distinguish between the grounds for false proof and the grounds for true, and further distinguish between proof that is considered compelling by the elite and not the commoners, and the kind in which the elite act as proof against the commoners. I shall also explain the areas where a few reports are far more convincing as proof than many reports and the reasons why a particular report gains currency although weak in it□s foundation while another, strongly based, gains no currency. I shall further elucidate the kind of report which may be considered safe from corruption and alteration despite its antiquity and its host of critics, as well as the need to relate traditions and hear historical reports…and why nations have achieved consensus over the truth in certain fields and differed in others…It is surprising that jurists do not distinguish between traditions and theologians do not bother to

[258] J. Montgomery, "al-J□□i□" in *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, vol. 311: *Arabic Literary Heritage 500-925, ed.* S. M. Toorawa and M. Cooperson (Detroit: Layman, Brucoli & Clark, 2005), 231-242.

> recitify historical reports since it is through history that people can tell a true from a false prophet, an honest man from a liar…Therefore, having classified and divided historical reports, I shall turn to the proofs of the Prophet….then categorize traditions by importance and arrange them in ranks…using time honoured methods and necessary proofs.[259]

Although al-J□□i□ sets questions which he himself does not necessarily answer, the observations which are made reflect the debates that took place in the 3rd/9th century between different Muslim sects. Questions such as the weight of evidence, the proper transmission of sacred texts and the truth and falsity of historical reporting were all vehemently debated. Al-J□□i□ first discusses the transmission of historical reports:

> Know that all knowledge of the absent entity, whatever it may be, can be attained in one of three ways…As regard things not observed by you but which are perceptible and were in fact perceived by others, the mode of attaining knowledge thereof is through reports of multiple witnesses, carried by friend as well as foe, the pious man as well as the villain. These are so widespread that, for those who hear them, there is no problem in believing in them. In this mode of knowledge, the learned and the ignorant are on the same level. But there may be another kind of report, more specific, but known only through inquiry…such as a group who transmit a report which you know full well- even if most do not- that a similar group could not have conspired to fabricate, given the differences in their way of life and the unlikelihood that they could have known each other. In such a report, falsehood is impossible. But there may be other reports, even more specific, transmitted by one or two men, who may be telling the truth or may be lying. The truth of this report

[259] Abū □Uthm□n □Amr b. Ba□r al-J□□i□, *Ras□□il al-Jāḥiẓ*, ed. H. al-Sandubi (Cairo: Yuṭlab min al-Maktabah al-Tij□r□yah al-Kubr□, 1933), 117-118.

> depends at heart on the good opinion you have of the reporter and your confidence in his impartiality. But this kind of report can never attain the same status, in your or anyone else□s heart, as the first two kinds of reports.[260]

Al-J□□i□ felt that little attention by the scholars of his generation was paid to both secular narrative and Prophetic *□ad□th*. Reports were therefore categorized by al-J□□i□ into groups of accreditation. To al-J□□i□, even if a report was transmitted by only a few people, it could still possess the credibility of a report which has been reported from a greater number of witnesses. It was as if the *ad□b*, a member of the intellectual elite demanded standards of truth that were quite distinct from those that satisfied the commoners'.[261] Certain reports were classified as possible and others as impossible, and al-J□□i□ would appraise these reports:

> The truth which God commanded, made desirable and urged us to embrace is that we should reject two kinds of reports: those that are contradictory and implausible and those that are impossible in nature and beyond the capacity of created beings. If a report belongs to neither of these two kinds, and I subject to being judged possible, one proceeds by seeking confirmation. In this matter, truth must be your object and honesty your aim, whatever it may be, and whether you assent to it willingly or unwillingly.[262]

The earliest works of al-J□□i□ focus on the question of the Im□mate. Fragments of which remain, including *Kit□b Isti□q□q al-*

---

[260] Abū □Uthm□n □Amr b. Ba□r al-J□□i□, *Rasaʿil al-J□□i□*, ed. A.S.M. Harun (Cairo, 1965), vol. 1, 119-120.
[261] T. Kh□lid□, *Arab Historical Thought,* 106.
[262] Al-J□□i□, *Kitab al-hayaw□n*, ed, A.S.M. Harun, 2nd edition (Cairo: Muṣṭaf□ al-B□b□ al-Ḥalab□, 1965-1969), vol. 3, 328-9.

Imāmah: Bayān madhāhib al-Shīʿah[263] (The Necessity of the Imāmate: An Exposition of the Different Kinds of Shīʿah) and *Jawābāt fī l-imāmah* (Replies Concerning the Imāmate).[264] Propaganda would be directed against the Shīʿīs and the more moderate Zaydī sect as well.

In his *Kitāb al-ʿUthmāniyyah*, al-Jāḥiẓ defends the position of the first three caliphs and differs with ʿAlī's judgement in not finding the killers of ʿUthmān, thereby strengthening the ʿAbbāsid claims for succession.[265] This is an important source on the trend known as *ʿUthmāniyyah* as a pro-Umayyad form of proto-Sunnī religiosity. At the same time, Muʿāwiya and the Ummayads are attacked on grounds of their misdeeds in the Ṣiffīn arbitration, again helping diffuse anti-ʿAbbāsid Umayyad support.[266] Al-Jāḥiẓ devoted much effort to the question of authority and notably, to the question of Imāmate.[267] The *ʿUthmāniyyah,* in particular, is a reply to Shīʿī doctrine and its positions on Imāmate. This is also the line of argument in his *Faḍīlat al-Muʿtazila* (The Excellence of the Muʿtazila). Ibn al-Rawandī wrote the *Faḍīhat al-Muʿtazila* (The Infamy of the Muʿtazila), as a defense of Imāmate. Ibn al-Rawandī was originally a Muʿtazilī who had become Shīʿī.[268] He was detested by the Muʿtazila for this betrayal, some claiming he wrote his

---

[263] H. Sandubī, *Rasāʾil al-Jāḥiẓ* (Cairo, 1933).
[264] J. Ashtiany and J. D. Latham,*ʿAbbāsid Belles-Lettres* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 83.
[265] Afsaruddin, *Excellence and Precedence*.
[266] Ashtiany and Latham,*ʿAbbāsid Belles-Lettres*, 84.
[267] See J. Montgomery, "Jāḥiẓ's *Kitāb al-Bayan wa-l-Tabayin"*, in Julia Bray (ed.), *Writing and Representation: (London: Muslim Horizons,* 2006)*,* 91-152.
[268] S. Stroumsa, "Ibn al-Rawandī's *Sū adab al-mujadala*: The Role of Bad Manners in Medieval Disputations" in H. Lazarus-Yaffe, et al., (eds.), *The Majlis: Interreligious Encounters in Medieval Islam, Studies in Arabic Language and Literature* (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 1999), 60-76. See also "The Blinding Emerald: Ibn al-Rawandī's *Kitab al-Zumurrud*", *JAOS,* 114 (1994), 163-85.

work on the Im□mate for a paltry sum of thirty dinars.[269] While none of these works are unfortunately extant, al-Khayy□□, viewed as the master of the Baghd□d□ Mu□tazil□ school, defended al-J□□i□ and refuted Ibn al-Rawand□ in his *al-Inti□□r* (Victory).[270] The outline of the debate that ensued between Ibn al-Rawand□ and al-J□□i□ may be reconstructed from al-Khayy□□□s work.

Ibn al-Rawand□ believed that al-J□□i□ would choose true and false statements about the Sh□□□ and arrange them together, in turn defaming the religion of Islam - not just the Sh□□□.[271] This he believed would lead to persecution of the Sh□□□. Ibn al-Rawand□ felt that many Sh□□□ were not equipped to respond to the Mu□tazil□ scholars.[272] Al-Khayy□□ attacks Ibn al-Rawand□□s stance on the companions, referring to his belief that the companions disobeyed the Prophet and did not pledge allegiance to his rightful successor. He also rejects his assertion that barring five or six companions, the rest disobeyed the Prophet after he died. Khayy□□ moreover rejects the statement of Ibn al-Rawand□ that there were companions who pledged allegiance to Ab□ Bakr because they had a hatred for □Al□ because of his record of having killed their parents in the earliest Islamic battles.[273]

Al-Taw□□d□

The discussion concerning leadership in early Islam would continue with al-Taw□□d□. Ab□ □ayy□n al-Taw□□d□ is revered as

[269] Aḥmad b. Yaḥy□ Ibn al-Murta□□, *□abaq□t al-Mu□tazila/Die Klassen der Mu□taziliten von Ibn al-Murta□□*, ed. Sussana Diwald-Wilzer (Beirut: Imrimerie Catholique, 1961), 92, as cited in L. Clarke, *Sh□ □ite Heritage,* 126.
[270] □Abd al-Raḥ□m b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Khayy□□, *Kit□b al-Inti□ar wa-al-radd □ala Ibn al-Rawand□ al-mul□id,* ed. and tr. Albert Nader (Beirut: al-Matba□ah al-Kathulikiyah, 1957).
[271] Al-Khayy□□, *Kit□b al-Inti□ar,* 78.
[272] Al-Khayy□□, *Kit□b al-Inti□ar,* 13.
[273] Al-Khayy□□, *Kit□b al-Inti□ar,* 75.

one of the most important figures in early Islamic thought and classical Arabic literature. He was born in Baghdād in 314/926 to a poor family and was known to be an ascetic, following the Sufi groups in the earlier period of his life. Al-Tawḥīdī studied Arabic and Islamic sciences, including philosophy, for ten years, from 361/971. However, he would later revert back to the Islamic sciences and the study of Arabic. Al-Tawḥīdī was a copyist by profession, a job he continuously sought to escape. He was a man whose love was books, ironically burning them in a moment of despair due to old age in the year 400/1009. Amongst al-Tawḥīdī's works on leadership which will be examined are *Kitāb al-imtāʿ wa-al-muʾānasah*[274] and *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir.*[275]

Al-Tawḥīdī placed great importance on three fundamental values - religion, learning and morality - alongside the need to understand the value of reason in the life of the human being. Al-Tawḥīdī felt a sense of frustration that the society which surrounded him did not hold on to these values. He felt it was lacking in morality and facing intellectual decline. People were not seeking knowledge nor showing any interest in educating themselves. People were not using the Arabic language as they could have, especially his contemporaries.[276] It was in this same period that the Shīʿa were gaining ascendancy through the medium of the Būyids. This context allows us to understand al-Tawḥīdīs view of authority in general and of the Shīʿa in particular.

Jurisprudential Sources

[274] Abū Ḥayyān ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Tawḥīdī, *Kitāb al-imtāʿ wa-al-muʾānasah*, ed. Aḥmed Amīn and Aḥmed al-Zayn (Cairo, 1953), vol. 1, 16-18.
[275] Abū Ḥayyān ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, ed. Wadād al-Qāḍī (Beirut, 1988), vol. 7, 53.
[276] W. al-Qāḍī, "al-Rakaʿiz al-fikrīyyah fī naẓrat Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī ilī l-mujtama", *al-Abḥāth*, 23 (1970), 15-32.

The Yemenite ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Sanʿānī (d. 211/826) occupies a prominent position in Islamic literature. His revered work, known as the *Muṣannaf*, is seen as one of the earliest jurisprudential texts. It refers to the different categories of Islamic jurisprudence. It is divided into eleven volumes and is mainly based on rare manuscripts which have survived.[277] At a young age, ʿAbd al-Razzāq would attend the lectures which were given in Yemen by Ibn Jurayj in 144/761-2. He would also attend the classes of his most important teacher, Ma'mar b. Rashīd. He studied under Ma'mar for a total period of eight years, from 145/762 until 153/770. Furthermore, scholars such as Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778) and Sufyān b. Uyayna (d. 198/814) were also known to have taught him when they were residing in Yemen. It was in this period that the greatest amount of material which he later transmitted would be received.[278] Without a doubt these scholars would have a great affect on his learning and on his compilation, with Ibn Jurayj's transmission, as an example, covering one third of the whole *Muṣannaf*.[279]

Isḥāq b. Ibraḥīm al-Dabarī is viewed as being the main transmitter within the *Muṣannaf*. He attended the classes of ʿAbd al-Razzāq at the age of six or seven alongside his father. He would view himself therefore as having permission to transmit directly from ʿAbd al-Razzāq.[280] The great number of sources would indicate that the *Muṣannaf* was originally based on a collection of large independent works. When examining its

[277] ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Sanʿānī, *Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī, 11 vols. (Simlak, Dahbel/Beirut, 1391/1972).
[278] H. Motzki, 'The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Sanʿānī as a Source of Authentic *Aḥādīth* of the First Century AH', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 50 (1991): 1-21, 5.
[279] Motzki, 'The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Sanʿānī', 1-21, 6.
[280] Motzki, 'The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Sanʿānī', 1-21, 2.

authenticity and reliability, a few key points must be noted. When ʿAbd al-Razzāq is uncertain about the origin of a narration, he admits this openly. If he was a forger, he would not express such doubts, as this would raise questions concerning his work and affect the purpose of his study. Furthermore, forgery is unlikely considering he is willing to narrate from anonymous transmitters, and relies on his informants as the main sources.[281] Indeed, Motzki stresses the authenticity of the *Muṣannaf* as a source of authentic *ḥādīth* by stating that:

> While studying the *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq, I came to the conclusion that the theory championed by Goldziher, Schacht, and in their footsteps, many others – myself included – which in general, reject *ḥādīth* literature as a historically reliable sources for the first century AH, deprives the historical study of early Islam of an important and a useful type of source.[282]

Al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān[283]

Al-Qāḍī Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān b. Abū ʿAbdillāh Muḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Tamīmī is revered as one of the illustrious Fāṭimid jurists and is generally known as Abū Ḥanīfa. He served the four caliphs of the Fāṭimid dynasty and was highly respected under the leadership and rule of al-Muʿizz li-Dīnillāh. His compositions would be presented to the caliphs for correction and confirmation. He wrote works of biography, history and jurisprudence and was a prolific author who left behind

[281] Motzki, 'The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. ʿAmmām al-Sanʿānī', 1-21, 4.
[282] Motzki, 'The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. ʿAmmām al-Sanʿānī', 1-21, 21.
[283] Al-Qāḍī Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān b. Abū ʿAbdillah Muḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Tamīmī (d. 363/974).

approximately fourty-four books of which half have survived.[284] The most respected of his works is *Da□□□im al-Isl□m*, compiled in the rule of al-Mu□izz. A great bulk of his writing is devoted to Fāṭimid Jurisprudence.[285] His *Da□□□im al-Isl□m* and *□Urj□za* will be examined as belles-lettres literature.

Islam is built on seven pillars according to al-Q□□□. They are *al-wal□yah*, *al-□ah□rah*, *al-□al□t*, *al-zak□t, al-□awm, al-h□jj* and *al-jih□d*.[286] The chapter entitled *"al-Wal□yah"* examines the Im□mate of □Al□ b. Ab□ □□lib and the way it continued through the progeny of his son □usayn. This belief is seen as the pillar of the religion and is considered to be a cardinal principle. The essence of *al-wal□yah* is having knowledge of the Im□m of the time. The traditions in the *Da□□□im* are based on the authority of Ja□far al-S□diq, the pillar of Sh□□□ jurisprudence. The full title of the work portrays the background of the traditions and the basis of what is narrated: *Da□□□im al-Isl□m wa dhikr al-□al□l wa□l □ar□m wa□l qa□□y□h wa□l a□k□m □an Ahl al-Bayt Ras□lill□h.* In his *Kit□b ikhtil□f u□□l al-madh□hib wal radd □ala man kh□lafah al-□aqq f□h□*, he refutes the four renowned schools of Sunn□ jurisprudence. *Shar□ al-Akhb□r* discussed the lives of the Im□ms until Ja□far al-S□diq, of which eleven parts are dedicated to □Al□. In *Kit□b al-Man□qib l□ Ahl al-Bayt Ras□lill□h wa□l math□lib l□ Ban□ Umayyah,* he discusses the difference between the piety of Ban□ H□shim and the worldliness of the Umayyads. This discussion examines their respective outlook from pre-Islamic Arabia until examining each of the Umayyad leadership and their opinions and behaviour, ending with the

[284] A. A. Fyzee, "Q□□□ an-Nu□mān: The Fāṭimid Jurist and Author", *JRAS* (1934), 1-32.
[285] Al-Q□□□ al-Nu□m□n, *Da□a□im al-Islam,* ed. A.A. Fyzee, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1951-60).
[286] Al-Q□□□ al-Nu□m□n, *Da□a□aim*, vol. 1, 2.

Umayyads of Spain.

Al-Q□□□ al-Nu□m□n was also a renowned versifier. Four long *arajiz* (poems) were composed, discussing theological as well as jurisprudential issues. Two have survived, the first *al-□Urj□za al-muntakhabah* and the second *al-□Urj□za al-mukht□rah*. The first work, *al-□Urj□za al-mukht□rah,* was composed during the rule of al-Q□□im (322/934-46), and is the oldest examination of the subject of authority in Fāṭimid literature. It was a pioneering work in a number of ways.[287] Later *du□□t* (Muslim missionaries, sing. *d□□*), such as Ibr□h□m al-Naisab□r□ and Ab□ al-Faw□ris A□mad b. Ya□q□b, pursued this work and also wrote works on Im□mate.[288] Al- Nu□m□n did write a more elaborate work in prose entitled *Kit□b f□l Im□mah* compiled in four volumes but it has been lost. Hence the *□Urj□za* acts as one of the few works to have survived that period and discusses the early controversies and issues surrounding Im□mate.

To consolidate their position and power, the Fāṭimid state, which had just emerged, had to intellectually counteract and refute the arguments of the opposition, with the issue of Im□mate being the crux of the problem. Three groups are refuted within the *□Urj□za*; the Kh□rijites, the Mu□tazilites and the Sunn□tes. The *□Urj□za* sought to counter the beliefs and attitudes held by these three groups. It throws light on the various positions taken by the three groups, and the argument is produced to defend the views of the Fāṭimids and refute the others. The style of the *□Urj□za* is Fāṭimid in the sense that it begins by denying any similarity between the Creator and the created. This is

[287] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in I.K. Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nuʿm□n*, 26.
[288] M. Goriawala, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Fyzee collection of Ismaili Manuscripts,* no. 24 and no. 49 entitled *Ithb□t al-Im□mah* (Bombay: University of Bombay, 1965).

followed by the praise of the Prophet Muḥammad and his Family upon whom God has bestowed the Guardianship of the Religion in their lineage, which is sealed with the Mahdī. The *Urjūza* manifests the light of the belief in the Imāmate of the Progeny of Muḥammad.

Historical Sources

Amongst the leading historical sources and works are those from a group known as 'chronological schematizers' by Donner.[289] These include:

a) Ma'mar al-Shaybānī (d. 103/721). Of the accounts directly narrated on the authority of al-Shaybānī, only a few remain. The majority reach us via transmitters such as Sayf and al-Madā'inī. He was known as a collector of historical accounts, with an account narrated which discusses the Prophet Muḥammad's life.[290]

b) Muḥammad b. Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742). He played a major role in establishing the narrative of the *sīrah*, as a number of dates are attributed to him by Ibn Isḥāq amongst others.[291]

c) Ibn Isḥāq (d. 150/767). Known for his biography of the Prophet which was written at the behest of the 'Abbāsids towards the end of his life. However, he does admit at times uncertainty about certain dating of events and conveyed a large number of reports discussing civil wars and the history of the later caliphs.[292]

---

[289] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 242.
[290] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 242.
[291] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 242.
[292] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 243.

d) Abū Mikhnaf (d. 157/774) made major contributions to Islamic history and is credited with having composed forty titles.[293]

d) Sayf b. ʿUmar (d. 184/800) is regarded as one of the main narrators for al-Ṭabarī's work, especially when examining the Riddah wars and the early Islamic conquests and 'must be reckoned among the most important architects of chronological schemes'.[294] The question is sometimes raised as to whether the chronological order of a narrative is Sayf's or is taken from informants.[295] However, de Goeje and Wellhausen discuss the inconsistency of his narrations.[296]

e) Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823) is revered as one of the 'major chronological systematizers of the early Islamic historiographical tradition'[297] and thoroughly discusses the life of the Prophet and the Islamic conquests which took place within the east and west.

f) Naṣr b. Muzāḥim al-Minqarī (d. 212/827) was a renowned historian and a contemporary of al-Wāqidī whose sources originate from the same period as Abū Mikhnaf. One of the numerous works attributed to him has survived - *The Kitāb Ṣiffīn* - while the rest are viewed as being pro-Shīʿī.

---

[293] For Abū Mikhnaf, see C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 2. See also Khalīl b. Aybak al-Ṣafadī, *al-Wāfī bi-al-wafayāt,* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2000), xxii, 41ff and U. Sezgin, *Abū Mikhnaf: Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie des umaiyadischen Ziet* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) as cited by C. Robinson.
[294] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 244.
[295] For Sayf ibn ʿUmar al-Asadī al-Tamīmī's work, see the *Kitāb al-Riddah waʾl-futūh* and *Kitāb al-jamal wa-masīr ʿĀ'isha wa-ʿAlī: A Facsimile Edition of the Fragments Preserved in the University Library of Imām Muḥammad Ibn Saʿud Islamic University in Riyadh,* vol. 1 (Leiden: Smitskamp Oriental Antiquarium, 1995).
[296] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 245.
[297] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 245.

g) ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Madāʾinī (d. ca. 235/850). In examining the narratives which discuss Islamic origins, al-Madāʾinī looks to provide chronological relationships. His narrations deal with the life of the Prophet, early conquests and narratives about the first civil war. Informants include ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr and al-Zuhrī.

Very little is known about the life of Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāṭ (d. 240 AH). He was born in Baṣra. He was revered for his outstanding memory and skills as a writer.[298] He did not travel in the way many of his contemporaries did, not even to Baghdād, as there is no mention of him in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādīs *Tārīkh*. His teachers were known to either be living in Baṣra or from a Baṣran origin. In the 3rd century, Baṣra was renowned as a centre of learning, a centre for the disciplines of history, *ḥadīth* and grammar. Amongst his teachers was Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālisī and Ismāʿīl b. Umayyah. But he was closest to Yazīd b. Zuray. However, amongst his students was Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī, the renowned author of the Ṣaḥīḥ, as well as Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal. Al-Bukhārī would later quote from Khalīfah. He was viewed as being fair in his portrayal of Umayyad rule and would narrate from partisans of their government as well as dissenters. Furthermore, his truthfulness is recognised in the fact that he did not side with the Muʿtazilīs and their opinion when cases were put forward against their opponents in Baṣra.[299]

The order is chronological and begins with an introduction concerning the importance of the study of history for Muslims as

[298] Shams al-Dīn Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-Aʿyān*, (Cairo, 1948), vol. 2, 243.
[299] ʿUmar Farouq, *Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ Muʾarrikhān* (Baghdād: 1967), 9-10.

a whole.[300] He then discusses how the Arabs would record their dates and the development of the *Hijrī* calendar.[301] He uses Ibn Isḥāq in discussing the biography of Prophet Muḥammad. The issue of authority and the leadership struggle is narrated in the sections on ʿUthmān[302] and the battles of Jamal and Ṣiffīn.[303] The discussion concerning Muʿāwiya's leadership begins in the year 41 AH[304] and a whole section of his *Tārīkh* is dedicated to the execution of Ḥujr and the pledge of allegiance to Yazīd.[305]

One may also refer to Ibn Qutaybah ʿAbdallāh b. Muslim al-Dīnawarī (d. 276/899). His historical work is written in an encyclopedic style, with important information on the nature of the Umayyad caliphate, particularly ʿAbd al-Mālik. He does not, however, discuss authorities for accounts of this period of rule. Furthermore, one of the works of Abū Ḥanifa Aḥmad b. Dāwūd al-Dīnawarī (d. 282/895), called a*l-Akhbār al-ṭiwāl,* is an examination of the Umayyad period and focuses on the religious and political movements in the Eastern region of the empire. Caliphs are discussed along with their opposition. There is no discussion of sources, nor any critical analysis.

Al-Balādhurī[306] was the author of the *Futūḥ al-Buldān* and the *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*. He had travelled extensively throughout much of Syria and Baghdād. He was taught by Ibn Abū Shaibah as well as al-Madāʾinī. Al-Balādhurī was a drug addict and his grandfather was a drunk, which was believed to have led to his madness.[307] However, when sober, al-Balādhurī was known for his

[300] ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. Muḥammad Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Tārīkh Khalīfah b. Khayyāṭ* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmīyyah, 1995), 3.
[301] Farouq, *Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ Muʾarrikhān*, 14.
[302] Farouq, *Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ Muʾarrikhān*, 98.
[303] Farouq, *Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ Muʾarrikhān*, 106-119.
[304] Farouq, *Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ Muʾarrikhān*, 123.
[305] Farouq, *Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ Muʾarrikhān*, 131.
[306] Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā (d. 279/892).
[307] D.S. Margoliouth, *Lectures on Arab Historians* (Calcutta : University of Calcutta, 1930), 116.

impartiality.[308] He worked within the ʿAbbāsid court but contemporaries found him to be a meritorious scholar. Sharīf al-Murṭaḍā, the renowned Shīʿī scholar, states that 'it is common knowledge that he is a recognised Sunnī authority; that he does in no way support the Shīʿa; and that he is exact in everything he tells'.[309] Being pro-Umayyad in a period where al-Manṣūr was at the helm is viewed as praiseworthy. His discussion of Umayyad rule may indicate an intent to take the ʿAbbāsids towards this course of government. However, whether the ʿAbbāsids viewed the Umayyad caliphate as being legitimate is unclear.

The *Futūḥ* consists of a discussion of Muslim conquests, from the period of the Prophet to the Riddah wars and the conquests of Syria, Egypt, Iraq and Persia. Sources are often identified, including Abū Mikhnaf, al-Wāqidī, and particularly al-Madāʾinī, who is used more extensively by al-Balādhurī than al-Ṭabarī. He is more willing to criticize certain material and more than one narration related to a certain event is presented. *Futūḥ al-Buldān* provides information on the administrations of the conquered provinces and discusses taxation, Arabic money and the usage of the Arabic language as the official language. Although limited to the Umayyad period, this does not necessarily display 'his historiographic pecularities'[310] but rather the reality that this was the first and only dynasty ruling the state in the pre-ʿAbbāsid era. The rule of ʿAbd al-Mālik is discussed along with the administration and organization of the state under his caliphate.

Before al-Balādhurī, genealogies had been reformulated in

[308] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 136.
[309] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 136.
[310] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 137.

relation to the new piety which was seen as being dominant in the period of the early ʿAbbāsid era by Muḥarrij, Musʿāb and Zubayr. The Quraysh was seen as the pivot of the community, its aristocracy, and its guiding spirit. However, al-Balādhurī's genealogies were conceived on a much greater scale. Al-Balādhurī's *Ansāb* is not just a discussion of prominent families, but may also be seen as a comprehensive historical discussion. The work may be seen to be directed to the secretarial classes to which al-Balādhurī belonged. Previous genealogies are viewed as epic works and religiously 'heroic', but al-Balādhurīs *Ansāb* is viewed as being more 'romantic and less deferential towards Quraysh'.[311]

The ʿAbbāsid state was more than a century old when al-Balādhurī began his writings.[312] He was known as a middle-ranking bureaucrat for the main part of his professional life. There were no fixed policies or religious opinions in the early ʿAbbāsid caliphate. These shifts in opinion helped to encourage differences in culture in the ʿAbbāsid cities. 'The third/ninth century might be called the age of debate and recapitulation in Arab Islamic intellectual history'.[313] This can be seen as having been earlier discussed in the shift of intellectual positions which was assumed by al-Jāḥiẓ. The communities' traditions, however, were being reformulated in this period. In one intellectual circle was al-Jāḥiẓ, while the likes of Bukhārī and Muslim were in another.

As well as historical work, he compiled the *Ansāb* work known as

[311] T. Khālidī, *Arab Historical Thought*, 58; also M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin: Univeristy of Texas Press, 1981).
[311] Khālidī, *Arab Historical Thought*, 59.

Ansāb al-Ashrāf. The *Ansāb* is a detailed work on Arabic genealogy and a very important source of biographical literature. While the *Ansāb* examine all the major provinces of the ʿAbbāsid state, the *Ashrāf* discusses those who made their influence felt. The biography of the Prophet marks the beginning of the work, and al-Balādhurī relies on Hishām al-Kalbī, a fellow genealogist, who was not necessarily taken as an authority by biographers such as al-Wāqidī. The account is vivid and has a smooth narrative. The genealogy of the extended family of Muḥammad is discussed at the end of the Prophetic period. This is followed by a discussion of Muḥammadʼs personal life. The renowned families of Quraysh are then discussed, followed by a discussion of lesser known families. The work may be seen as being unfinished. Leading figures of each of the families form the apex of the discussion.

Furthermore, al-Balādhurī discusses the civil wars of the first three centuries and the Khawārij as an opposition movement. This discussion allows the reader to understand the crisis of leadership and authority that emerges in the early period of Islamic history, notably in the caliphate of Muʿāwiya. Nobles and rebels are discussed, and the author may arguably be seen as being independent of any ideological attachments. When examining the leading figures in the formative period, the stories which are discussed are anecdotal and full of wisdom. The literary *topos* of a caliph or governor asking one of the wise men of the community is a tool used by al-Balādhurī. However, his analysis is indeed balanced, especially in seeking to understand Muʿāwiya’s leadership. Narratives are provided which show Muʿāwiya in both a favourable and unfavourable light. At times, the hypocrisy of certain revered leaders is clearly portrayed. One example is his portrayal of Yazīd’s caliphate and his

governor Ibn ʿIdah seeking to gain the pledge of allegiance from ʿAbdullāh b. al-Zubayr .[314]

To settle any argument relating to the veracity of a report, including a date or an event, the phrase '*wa hādhā al-thabāt'* (and this is the firm or established truth) would be used. Al-Wāqidī's school differs from this in their usage of the phrase '*wa hādhā al-mujtama' ʿalayhā'* (and this is the agreed upon truth). Al-Balādhurī's tone is that of a bureaucrat speaking to 'lesser mortals',[315] while al-Wāqidī's manner is that of a scholar speaking to other scholars who have similar mindsets. Al-Jāḥiẓ vehemently attacked the morals and attitudes of the state secretaries in his epistle.[316] Al-Balādhurī's use of *isnād* is evident due to his use of phrases such as *qālū* (they say) and *yuqāl* (it is said). While the citation for *isnāds* is evident when discussing Prophetic history, according to Khālidī, the employment of narrative for non-Prophetic history, shows how the historians of the 3rd century were prepared to adopt a different attitude to *akhbār*, a word now more strictly employed to denote historical reports in general.[317]

Importantly, however, al-Balādhurī does not discuss what criteria is used to not only test a particular report, but little indication is given as to why one narrator is given preference over another. In many cases 'his own brusque assertions of the truth must suffice'.[318] Historical events are presented in a genealogical framework. Use is made of both oral and written sources. The reports from personalities such as al-

[314] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4/1, 309.
[315] T. Khālidī, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 60.
[316] Al-Jāḥiẓ, "Fī dhamm akhlāq al-kuttāb", *Rasaʾil*, ed. Harun, vol. 2, 187-209.
[317] T. Khālidī, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 61.
[318] T. Khālidī, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 61.

Mad□□in□ begin with, ‘He informed me’, stating that this was a primary source. In quoting from al-Mad□□in□ up until al-Mutawakkil, the compilation of his work would have taken up to twenty years, with the *Fut□ḥ* being written in and around the same period. The influence of the debates concerning the Mu□tazila may have had an influence as it was still of interest up to Mutawakkil. Information is used from predecessors such as Ibn Is□□q and Ibn Sa□d. Sources are used very concisely, hence the reputation it has among subsequent scholars. Over a third of the work is devoted to Umayyad history. There are also long chapters on Ibn al-Zubayr and al-Mukht□r.

Very little is known about the life of A□med b. D□w□d al-D□nawar□. His Persian origin is indicated by his grandfather’s name, Wanand. He resided in D□nawar for a period of time, as can be seen in his *nisbah*, and he is known to have died around 282 AH. He is therefore placed in the generation before al-□abar□. Amongst his wide range of interests are studies on mathematics, natural sciences and philology. He also wrote about Qur□□nic sciences and history. Amongst his scientific contributions is his revered work *Kit□b al-nab□t*, which seemed to have been lexicographical.[319]

His renowned historical work was *al-Akhb□r al-ṭiw□l*. This work stems from an Iranian viewpoint and discusses the Sassanids. In regards to the onset of Islam, it speaks about the provinces which the Sassanids controlled. Although he gives no *isn□ds*, there is the occasional reporting of a *khabar* from an eyewitness account, where the *akhb□r* becomes a continuous narrative. The book was viewed as having been written for its literary and entertaining qualities. Contemporary and later historians

[319] B. Lewin, “al-D□nawar□”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd editon, vol. 2, 300.

interestingly take little notice of this historical work. History was seen at the time as one of the vehicles for creative writing in prose and this has been seen as the aim of al-Dīnawarī.[320]

Al-Yaʿqūbī

Aḥmed b. Abī Yaʿqūb was born on either the northern or eastern provinces of the Islamic empire. He had spent much of his youth in Armenia. Yaʿqūbī travelled extensively and was a member of a family who were clerks.[321] He served the Ṭāhirids of Khurāsān. When the Ṭāhirid dynasty fell, he moved to Egypt and died in 284 AH.[322] He is known for his *Kitāb al-Buldān,* which provided a geographical description of the Islamic empire, including India and China.[323] The *Tārīkh* is evidently similar to al-Ṭabarī's account. The history of the patriarch of Israel and Jesus is discussed, followed by accounts of various nations as well as the pre-Islamic Arabs. The second part discusses the birth of Islam, the birth of the Prophet, and Islamic history until the year 259 AH. Muḥammad's death is followed by a discussion of the reign of the caliphs, close to the court of the Ṭāhirids. His work is viewed as thorough and is researched in depth. There is a plan to the work. Astrology is used to explain events as well as the fact that records are provided for the influential persons in that period of rule. Although earlier historians are not always mentioned, he does discuss some contemporary historians. His main subject is clearly reserved for the Umayyad and ʿAbbāsid periods and there is a question concerning possible

[320] Lewin, "al-Dīnawarī", vol. 2, 300.
[321] Margoliouth, *Lectures on Arabic Historians*, 125.
[322] C. Brockelmann, "al-Yaʿkūbī", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, vol. 8, 1152-3.
[323] Al-Yaʿqūbī, "Kitāb al-Buldān" in Ibn Rustah's *Aʿlāq al-nafīsah,* ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1892).

Sh□□□ affiliation.[324] Letters of the period, as well as orations, are recorded in great numbers. Of particular interest is his work being arranged according to reigns, in contrast to al-□abar□□s arrangement of material in relation to years.[325]

Al-□abar□

Ab□ Ja□far Mu□ammad b. Jar□r al-□abar□ (d. 310/923) is regarded as both a scholar and historian, who was born in □Am□l in □abar□stan.[326] His knowledge was gained by travelling to Baghd□d, Ba□ra, K□fah, Syria and Egypt. Al-□abar□ specialised in four areas: Qur□□nic studies, law, history and tradition. There is a belief that his burial on Saturday, the 4th Shawwal, took place at night due to his Sh□□□ inclination and fear of the people.[327] Al-□abar□ was a scholar both of law and *□ad□th* and would later inspire a legal school that would be named after him for a number of years, yet he had a public life that was embroiled in controversy. The scholarly concerns of the 3rd century were reflected in the immense works of al-□abar□. The history of creation and prophecy would be combined with the history of ancient nations, and to this he would add the biography of Mu□ammad, his expeditions, conquests and history of the community until the time of writing the *History of Prophets and Kings*. Al-□abar□'s methodology may be seen as being made up of attributes from his contemporaries. As Kh□lid□ states, 'In his methodology, it is possible to find echoes of Ibn Is□□q's universalism, of al-W□qid□'s consensualism and accuracy, of al-

[324] W.G. Millward, "Al-Ya□q□b□'s Sources and the Question of Sh□□□ Partiality", *Abr Nahrain*, 12 (1971-1972), 47-74, discusses how Ya□q□bi uses many of al-□abar□'s sources but more traditions are taken from members of the □Alid family.
[325] Margoliouth, *Lectures on Arabic Historians,* 126.
[326] Hugh Kennedy, *Al-□abar□: Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam* (London: Darwin Press, 2008).
[327] Margoliouth, *Lectures on Arabic Historians*, 101.

Bal□dhur□'s crisp verdicts and of Ibn □Abd al-□akam's moral epic'. And it was al-□abar□ who composed what was by far the most explicit defence of the *□ad□th* method in historical writing, while his annalistic arrangement enshrined a style that lasted until modern times.[328]

His most renowned work remains *T□r□kh al-Rusul wal Mul□k*. Margoliouth describes its compilation:

> He then asked the same question about a history of the world from Adam to his own time. When they were again told this would occupy 30,000 leaves, and they shrank from the proposal, he expressed disappointment at the lack of interest and energy, and again reduced his work to a tenth of its proposed bulk. It had taken eight years, from 283-290. The history, he then tells us, was completed on Wednesday last but two of Rab□' II, 303, having been continued to the end of 302.[329]

Al-□abar□ explains what he believes to be the means by which one can reach a definite knowledge of the past:

> Let him who examines this book of mine know that I have relied, as regards everything I mention therein which I stipulate to be described by me, solely upon what has been transmitted to me by way of reports which I cite therein and traditions which I ascribe to their narrators, to the exclusion of what may be apprehended by rational argument or deduced by the human mind, except in very few cases. This is because knowledge of the reports of men of the past and of contemporaneous news of men of the present do not reach the

[328] Kh□lid□, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 73; also F. A. Rosenthal, *The History of □abar□*, vol. 1, "General Introduction" and "From the Creation to the Flood" (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989).
[329] Margoliouth, *Lectures on Arabic Historians* , 102.

> one who has not witnessed them nor lived in their times except through the accounts of reporters and the transmission of transmitters, to the exclusion of rational deduction and mental inference. Hence, if I mention in this book a report about some men of the past which the reader or listener finds objectionable or worthy of censure because he can see no aspect of truth nor any factual substance therein, let him know that this is not to be attributed to us but to those who transmitted it to us and we have merely passed this on as it had been passed on to us.[330]

He worked with the *akhbār*, which stretched from the beginning of the creation of the world and spanned 14,000 years in al-Ṭabarī's estimation. These *akhbār* would considerably vary in 'import and veracity'.[331] Al-Ṭabarī worked with pre-historical material which had been transmitted by authorities such as Ibn ʿAbbās and Ibn Isḥāq, a biography of the Prophet transmitted by authorities such as Ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqidī, and reports which had examined the period of the Umayyads including that of Muʿāwiya's leadership transmitted by authorities including Awana, Sayf b. ʿUmar,[332] Abū Mikhnaf, Hishām al-Kalbī, al-Madāʾinī and al-Wāqidī.[333] These transmitters therefore have an extremely important role in al-Ṭabarī's *History*, with him having what may be argued to be a constricted role. He himself states that:

> We answer that we have already asserted in this work that we rely in most of what we describe in this book of ours on traditions

[330] Al-Ṭabarī, vol. 1, 6-7; also see R. S. Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 72.
[331] T. Khālidī, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 75.
[332] See Sayf b. ʿUmar, *Kitāb al-Riddah wal fūtūḥ* and *Kitāb al-Jamal wa masīr ʿĀʾisha wa-ʿAlī*.
[333] Jawād ʿAlī, "Mawarid *Tārīkh* al-Ṭabarī", *Majallat al-Majmaʿ al-ʿIlmī al-Iraqī*, 1 (1950), 143-213.

> and reports from our Prophet - upon whom blessings and peace - and from pious ancestors before us, to the exclusion of rational or mental deduction since most of it is an account of past events and present happenings, and these cannot be comprehended by rational inference and deduction.[334]

Some of these transmitters are however questionable in terms of their reliability. Amongst them is Sayf b. ʿUmar. His work was referred to by many, and certainly known as far as al-Andalus and North Africa, as pointed out by al-Qaysī.[335] Al-Ṭabarī introduces the reader to creation, through the Prophets to the Prophet Muḥammad, then the period of the successive generations until 290 AH. Each event is presented, placed and explained. The work is viewed as authoritative:

> Western scholars (and many Muslims as well) have generally considered al-Ṭabarī's presentation of early Islamic history to be quite typical of the mainstream view in the Islamic community, not too closely tied to the interests of any of the recognised sectarian groups, and often presenting divergent traditions representing conflicting points of view on the same episode. Consequently, it is reasonable to consider al-Ṭabarī's work as a representative product of the early historiographical tradition, if not, indeed as the culmination and crowning glory of that tradition.[336]

Al-Ṭabarī's history contains a small number of comments on the method employed and on the truth or falsity of a report. However, the majority view of scholars, like al-Wāqidī, is honoured. 'The first report is of better derivation (*asaḥḥu*

[334] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 55-56.
[335] Martin Hinds, "Sayf b. ʿUmar's Sources on Arabia", *Studies in the History of Arabia*, 1: ii (1979).
[336] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 128.

makhrajan) and with greater claim to truth because it is what most predecessors affirm'.[337] There are reports which al-Ṭabarī's views as being too well known to be ignored:

> The people for the Torah claim that there is no mention of Ād, Thamūd, Ād or Ṭālūt in the Torah. But they are well known among the Arabs of both the Jāhilīyya and Islam as Abraham and his people. Had I not been loath to prolong this work…I would have quoted verses about Ād and Thamūd by Jāhilī poets…enough to convince any who dispute their fame among the Arabs.

Furthermore, greater reliability is ascertained by referring to the experts, headed in Islam by the Prophet Muḥammad. He elaborates on this point when criticizing Hishām al-Kalbī:

> What Hishām says here with regard to King Hushang is baseless since the king is better known to experts on Persian genealogy than al-Ḥajjaj b. Yūsuf is to Muslim genealogists. Every people is better acquainted with their own ancestry, genealogy and achievements than others. In all matters of doubt, recourse must be had to the experts (*ilā ahlihā*).[338]

When examining his history, at first there does not seem to be any difficulty. Al-Ṭabarī uses a master narrative,[339] where God is the main connection between all the events that occur in history and the way society evolves within these events. Al-Ṭabarī attempts to historicize the Qurʾān:

> to transform it's timeless, one dimensional allegories into historical narrative that reflected the scholarly interests and attachment to 'pious ancestors' current among the *Ḥadīth* group to

[337] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 85.
[338] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 155.
[339] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 129.

> which he belonged.[340]

He explains the intention behind his *Tārīkh:*

> Our intention in this work is to record what we have indicated to be its content, that is, the history of mighty kings, both those who disobeyed and those who obeyed God, and the times of messengers and prophets...Let us now turn to the mention of the first to be given dominion and blessings by God who then showed ingratitude, denied and rebelled against God and waxed proud. God then withdrew His blessings, shamed him and brought him low. We shall follow this with a mention of those who followed in his path…and earned God's wrath…as well as contemporaneous or later praiseworthy kings who obeyed God.[341]

Al-Ṭabarī provides an annalistic history of the main figures in the Islamic community until the year 302 AH/915 CE.[342] The *Hijrī* calendar marks the introduction of the annals. Al-Ṭabarī does not give an explicit judgement on either important figures or events in the whole breadth of his history. An event is introduced and its causes, developments and outcomes are examined through employing the accounts of several informants. The annalistic scheme was already adopted by scholars of the 3rd century. To al-Ṭabarī, the historian was only a transmitter and he therefore does not comment on the veracity of reports or his judgements on an event. It was in these first three centuries that marked theological and political differences were prevalent within the community of believers. Politico-religious groups such as the Ṣufīs, Jaʿmīyyah, Khawārij and the Qadarīyyah were

[340] Khālidī, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 79.
[341] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 78.
[342] Humphreys argues that the *Tārīkh* of Khalīfah was the first general annalistic work to be composed in Arabic. See Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 196.

all present and giving their own commentaries and interpretations. However, al-Ṭabarī would not simply dismiss groups with whom he disagreed, he would be particular about selecting a report which was the most trustworthy through the knowledge of the experts in the field which was being examined.

To al-Ṭabarī, the struggle between prophets and kings symbolizes the ultimate destiny of world history, its origin and structure. There will be despotic kings and appointed caliphs and a struggle will ensue between them - just as it ensued between Moses and Pharaoh and Adam and Satan. 'It is a history of moral types, and one which might be expected to set the stage for what is to come in the Islamic portion of the work'.[343]

Therefore, the question of authority would be vital in the master narrative, as the caliph is seen as upholding God's authority on earth. The first discussion of authority is seen after Muḥammad passes away and is within the events happening in 11 AH, titled 'An Account of Saqīfah'. This is in contrast to the theory that the question of authority began after the *fitnah*.

Two political currents may have influenced al-Ṭabarī's views. The first being his Shāfiʿī background, with the second being from Ḥanbalī politico-religious thought. The latter was due to the fact that there was a rise in Ismāʿīlī movements at the time and that their propaganda was now reaching the countryside as well as the townships. Petersen explains:

> In this situation, the caliphal power, at any rate periodically, and especially when the constellations at the court made it

[343] Khālidī, *Arab Historical Thought*, 79.

> opportune - tried to obtain a compromise with a moderate wing of Sh□□□s, a state of affairs that logically led to the very unstable social and political balance during the following generation until the middle of the 10th century.[344]

The first *fitnah*, involving the third caliph □Uthm□n and his enemies, was a deeply divisive event. In seeking to reconstruct the civil war, al-□abar□ uses Ibn Is□□q, al-W□qid□ and Sayf, whom it may be argued had political bias when reporting. Al-□abar□ would present each version of the *fitnah*, without giving his opinion. He does, however, give a little indication of what these early struggles for power meant to him:

> As for W□qid□, he records many incidents in connection with the reasons which made the Egyptians march out against □Uthm□n and their camping at Dha Khushub. I have related some of them above and refrained from mentioning others owing to my abhorrence at mentioning them due to their repugnant nature.[345]

The *T□r□kh* is therefore a source of fundamental importance when examining the history of Islamic culture and civilization. Significantly, it allows us to understand the first three centuries of Islam in general, and portrays to us an understanding of the political movements of the time, both of the Umayyads and the Sh□□□. Indeed, when examining Sh□□□ history, many of the earlier sources were not preserved. There did not seem to be much concern in preserving monographs and collections before this period of the Sh□□□ cause and its depiction of events. These documents were seen as being dispensable once the larger compilations had emerged in the

[344] Petersen, *ʿAl□ and Muʿawiyah,* 156.
[345] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 2965.

early 9th to 11th centuries CE.[346] The *Tārīkh* would become a reference work for a later generation of Muslim historians. The scholar Claude Cahen states:

> It is obvious that al-Ṭabarī affords the basis of all research for the three centuries reviwed by him and that al-Ṭabarī's chronicle needs to be supplemented by all that can be discovered in authors who are wholly or partly independent of him.[347]

Al-Masʿūdī

Furthermore, when examining the renowned historians, ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-Masʿūdī is viewed as a younger contemporary of al-Ṭabarī. Although little is known of his life, he was possibly born in Iraq and died in 345 AH. He would travel extensively and would utilize the knowledge he gained in his works. Al-Masʿūdī would emphasize the value and technique of history. He applied a scientific method to history. This would be based on natural sciences and Indian and Greek philosophy. Amongst his several historical works is the *Murūj*, which could have been an abridgement of two larger works. The *Murūj al-Dhahab* was one of his later works and finished in 332 AH. It is viewed as a universal history. Beginning with creation, it proceeds with a discussion of various nations, and concludes with an account of Islamic history up until his time. While he does occasionally give *isnād*s, he dispenses with naming his authorities. ʿAlī is a prominent character, and this may be seen as showing his inclination to the Shīʿī school of thought. [348]

---

[346] S. Gunther, "Assessing the Sources of Classical Arabic Compilations: The Issue of Categories and Methodologies", 75-99.
[347] C. Cahen, *History and Historians*, 188-233; see also C. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography*, 30-32 and R. S. Humphreys, *Islamic History*, 72.
[348] Khālidī, *Islamic Historiography*, 28-54.

Ibn al-Athīr

Ibn al-Athīr[349] was born in the town of Jazīrat ibn ʿUmar on the Tigris in 555 AH/1160 CE and died in Moṣul in 630 AH/1232 CE.[350] His brothers were seen as being as famous as him. Majīd al-Dīn (544-606/1149-1210), the eldest, studied Qurʾān, *ḥadīth* and grammar. His youngest brother, Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn (558-637/1163-1239) wrote a number of books including *al-Mathal as-Sāʾir fī Adab al-Kātib wash-Shāʿir*.[351] In the town of Jazīrat ibn ʿUmar, Ibn al-Athīr received his elementary education. He went on to pursue further studies in Moṣul at the age of twenty four.[352] He would spend his time travelling between Damascus, Moṣul, Baghdād, and Mecca, studying under the greatest scholars of each town. His field of knowledge would range from history to genealogy to mathematics to religion. His final two years in Moṣul were spent studying *ḥadīth*.[353]

Amongst his several books were two biographical dictionaries of the companions of the Prophet: *Usd al-Ghābah* and *al-Lubāb*. The latter book is viewed as a recension of al-Ṣanʿānī's *Kitāb al-Ansāb*. The work was summarized by Ibn al-Athīr, who made corrections and added valuable new information. *Usd al-Ghābah* is also seen as a recomposition of an earlier text, reproduced without long chains or repetitions. However, a chapter was dedicated to these long chains where he made clear that his aim was to avoid repetition. The biographies are arranged in alphabetical order. His aim was to ensure that all the transmitted material relating to the biographies of the

[349] His full name was ʿAlī b. Muḥammad ʿIzz al-dīn Abū al-Ḥasan b. al-Athīr.
[350] Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayāt*, vol. 3, 35.
[351] Ibn Khallikan, *Wafayāt*, vol. 3, 557.
[352] Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Bāhir fī Tārīkh ad-Dawllah al-Tatabanya,* ed. A. Tulaymat (Cairo: 1962), 10.
[353] Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Bāhir*, 12.

companions of the Prophet were collected in one large book.[354]

His two most famous works, however, are historical, the first being *al-Bāhir fī Tārīkh ad-Dawlah al-Atabikīyah* and the second being *al-Kāmil fīl-Tārīkh*. The latter work commences with a narrative discussing the beginning of creation until the year 628 AH/1230 CE. Ibn al-Athīr would comment that when he was younger, he would enjoy reading history and would seek to learn from the lessons of the generations that preceded him.[355] Furthermore, he felt that the works of history of his predecessors were inadequate, with 'some dealing with the East, others with the West. Facts were covered in many of these through their repetition, in an ornate style, or through long chains of *isnād* to be cited, and many important events had been intentionally passed or omitted because of prejudice'.[356] He wanted to avoid such shortcomings and his *Kāmil* planned to narrate a great amount of historical information on all parts of the Muslim world in chronological order. Events are classified according to the year and the year is the unit of the chronological record. He would, however, mention the most important event of the year, and at times would group the less important events with the biographies of important personalities. He sought to ensure that a balance was achieved in recording events from both the Eastern and the Western parts of the Islamic world.[357]

His order is similar to the common method practised by Muslim historians, beginning with the creation of the world, then moving on to the stories of the biblical prophets and then to

[354] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 1, 11.
[355] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 1, 2.
[356] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 1, 4.
[357] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 1, 2-3.

pre-Islamic Arabia. His second volume would discuss the life of Prophet Mu□ammad and the caliphate of Ab□ Bakr and □Umar. His third volume would discuss the concept of authority and leadership, with a particular emphasis on the caliphates of □Uthm□n and □Al□. The fourth volume introduces Mu□□wiya and the Umayyads, examining their period of rule. He is often criticised for not naming his sources. He does, however, mention some of these sources, especially when discussing the first three centuries of Islamic history, and states that he drew much of his information from al-□abar□□s works.[358] Recent history would be written by employing material from Ibn al-Jawz□ and Ibn al-Hamathn□.[359] His history of Syria and Mesopotamia would be taken from Ibn □As□k□r, al-□A□□m□ and Ibn al-Qal□nis□. Furthermore, he would also employ oral sources, chief among them his father, where he would state, 'My father told me'.[360]

He describes how he would employ his sources by stating that 'I composed the most complete account of each event and I added to it the other information that was related from different versions of the same event'.[361] He would, therefore, not only read a source but also compare other sources, put them in order and then reproduce them. He would only seek to use trustworthy accounts, compare and analyse the different versions of a chosen event, and then seek in his own style to present the most accurate version. If there were conflicts in the sources regarding certain events, he would ensure that all the conflicting accounts were presented.

---

[358] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 1, 3.
[359] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 5, 111.
[360] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 11, 44.
[361] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 11, 3; see also D. S. Richards, "Ibn al-Ath□r and the Later Parts of the *K□mil*: A Study for Aims and Methods" in *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds*, ed. D. O. Morgan (London: SOAS, University of London, 1982), 88.

Theological Sources

Khārijites and Ibāḍīs - Sālim b. Dhakwān

There is disagreement concerning the identity of Sālim b. Dhakwān. One narration discusses Sālim as a local of Sīstān who was captured by the Arabs in 30/650.[362] A second narration discusses the first leader of the Ibāḍīs, Jābir b. Zayd, whose letters were addressed to him.[363] Furthermore, a third opinion is that al-Biysanī discusses Sālim as a scholar of the past in one of his epistles written in the 4th century.[364] Al-Shammākī discusses his presence in the generation of Abū ʿUbaydah (d. between 136/753 and 158/775).[365] The epistle terminology suggests two possible dates, 72-3 AH or the later Umayyad period. Cook was of the belief that it was written in 72-3 AH because of the fact that the rebellions of the Azāriqah, Dāwūd, ʿAṭiyah and Abū Fudayk are mentioned, using the word 'today', before their revolts were suppressed…These suggest that it was written after 72 AH but Cook continues to examine the fact that there is no mention of the revolt of Shabīb b. Yazīd whose revolt began in 76 AH.[366]

The Khārijites are believed to have emerged after the period of the first civil war (656-61 CE). Small subsects would later develop during the second civil war (684-692 CE) with an attempt

---

[362] Muḥammad Taqī Bahar, ed., *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* (Tehran, 1314), 82.
[363] A. K. Ennami, "A Description of New Ibādī Manuscripts from North Africa", *JSS*, 15 (1970), 65.
[364] P. Crone and F. W. Zimmerman, *The Epistle of Sālim b. Dhakwān* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 11.
[365] Abū al-ʿAbās Aḥmad b. Saʿīd al-Shammākhī, *Kitāb al-Siyār* (Cairo, 1301), 119.
[366] M. Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma* (Cambridge, 1981), 51.

to seize power coming during the third civil war (744-50 CE). They migrated to provinces where they could develop their beliefs religiously as well as politically. However, with the majority dying out, their partisans in the Ibd subsect survived in Oman and parts of North Africa. The Ibds preserved a number of important works compiled before c. 800 CE. These works are important in attempting to reconstruct Islamic thought and their position on the Imamate in general.[367]

Al-Ashr

Ab-l-asan Al b. Ismll al-Ashr was born in Bara in 873. He was known to be the descendant of one of the two arbiters at the Battle of iffn, Ab Msa al-Ashr. He studied Mutazilite thought under al-Jubb. He is known to have abandoned his Mutazilite beliefs and adopted the creed of the Ahl al-adth wal-Sunnah, at the age of forty. Three dreams in the Holy Month of Ramaḍn are reported to have affected him, with different versions of the story being narrated. The Prophet Muammad is thought to have appeared in each of these dreams.[368] Amongst his pupils, three in particular were known to have continued to teach the following generation of scholars: Ab Sal al-Sulk of Nshapr (d. 979); Ab-l-asan al-Bhil of Bara; Ab Abdillh b. Mujhd of Bara and Baghdd (d. 980). Al-Bqilln, Ibn Frq and al-Isfarynn were students of al-Bhil and al-Bqilln studied under Ibn Mujhd.[369]

Michel Allard discusses the extant works of al-Ashr.[370] After

[367] Crone and Zimmerman, *The Epistle of Slim b. Dhakwn*, 1.
[368] Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, 305.
[369] Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought*, 312.
[370] M. Allard, *Le Probleme des attributs divins dans la doctrine dal-Asari et de ses premiers grands disciples* (Beirut, 1965), 48-72.

examining the conclusions reached by Richard McCarthy in his editing and translating of *The Theology of al-Ash□□r□*,[371] he accepts the *Luma'*[372] as authentic. The *Ib□nah,*[373] however, is seen as being revised by al-Ash□□r□ in response to criticisms made by al-Barbah□r□ amongst other □anbalites. The *Maq□l□t*[374] is viewed as consisting of three original works; one being an account of the origin of Islamic texts; the second is a discussion on 'Points of *Kal□m*' and the third examining 'The Names and Attributes'.[375]

Al-Ash□□r□ states that the first disagreement in Islamic history related to Im□mate and the succession of the Prophet Mu□ammad. The event of Saq□fah is described as being central to the appointment of Ab□ Bakr as caliph, a conclusion to discussions held with the An□□r of Med□na.

Ab□ Ya□q□b Isḥāq b. Aḥmad al-Sijist□n□

The two concrete dates which are known about the life of al-Sijist□n□ are referenced by him in *Kit□b al-Iftikh□r*. The first is the year 322/934 when he was in Iraq having returned from the pilgrimage. Two incidents confirm this reference. He states that it was the year the □Abb□sid caliph al-Q□hir was deposed and blinded and al-R□□□ was enthroned. The second reference relates to the date in which *Kit□b al-Iftikh□r* was compiled. He repeats that it was three hundred and fifty years since the death of the

[371] R. J. McCarthy, *The Theology of al-Ash□□r□* (Beirut: 1953).
[372] Ab□ al-Hasan □Al□ b. Ism□□□l al-Ash□□r□, *Kit□b al-Luma'*, text and translation in McCarthy, *The Theology of al-Ash□□r□*.
[373] Ab□ al-Hasan □Al□ b. Ism□□□l al-Ash□□r□, *Kit□b al-Ib□nah □an u□□l al-diy□nah* (Hyderabad: 1321/1903); tr. by W.C. Klein as *The Elucidation of Islam's Foundation* (New Haven: 1940).
[374] Al-Ash□□r□, *Maq□l□t al-Isl□m□yyin*.
[375] Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought,* 307.

Prophet from which one can infer that the *Iftikhār* was compiled around the year 361/972. Although his age is not clear, he may have been in his sixties when writing the *Iftikhār*, with his death being placed between 386 and 393.[376] The *Iftikhār* provides an outline of Ismāʿīlī creed.

Apart from the *Rasāʾil Ikhwān al-Ṣafāʾ,* very few Ismāʿīlī works from the period have survived, highlighting the importance of the *Iftikhār*. The book is composed of seventeen chapters that cover the Ismāʿīlī creed. Chapters 7 and 8 discuss legateship and Imāmate.

Al-Sijistānī explains the reason he wrote the *Iftikhār*:

> Indeed, books about the teaching (*madhhab*) of 'the people of truth' (*ahl al-ḥaqāʾiq*) i.e., the Ismāʿīlīs, have multiplied and their mission (*daʿwah*) has spread to all distant lands. Consequently, those books have fallen into the hands of both deserving and undeserving people for various reasons, which need not be recounted in this book as they have already become manifest. Although there are many books (falsely) attributed to our *madhhab*, their authors have neither treated the subject with justice and fairness not have they realised what they were remonstrating against their opponents. They, therefore, composed these works without clear evidence that could safeguard their works from criticism of a critic or the disputation of a disputant. They tainted their discourse by speculation and fact. Hence, you (the reader) will find that most of the critics who allege that they are refuting this *madhhab* (i.e. the Ismāʿīlīs) are indeed people who are neither fully acquainted with this *madhhab* nor comprehend its basic principles…I therefore intend to compile in this book the basic elements of the creed of 'the

[376] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār*, ix.

> people of truth' concerning the oneness of God (*al-tawḥīd*), the angels, the names and their significance, the prophetic calling (*al-risālah*), the *waṣayah* (plenipotency, legateship) the Imāmate, resurrection (*al-baʿth*), reward, punishment, the Day of Judgement (*al-qiyāmah*), and the application of interpretation (*ʾaʿwīl*) to the revelation (Qurʾān) and the Law (*shariʿah*). I will state everything clearly, reveal its hidden (meaning) and present it to the opponents. If they are able to discredit it, let them do so. But I do not believe they are capable.[377]

Al-Sijistānī calls the book *al-Iftikhār*, or 'The Boast', because:

> We are proud to be in the right, as opposed to those who have gone astray relying on the creed of their forefathers without guidance and the Manifest book. Everyone who possesses a treasure, or a valuable property, is proud of his possession knowing full well that his prized possession is prone to disintegration and subject to destruction. Hence, it is justifiable for 'the people of truth' to be proud of what they have acquired and superintend, because this treasure, i.e., the possession of truth, is indestructible. What pride and joy could be greater than comprehending the truth and alighting on the right path?[378]

Al-Sijistānī fervently followed that which he believed and was a firm advocate of speaking out against the 'people of different persuasions'. This could have contributed to his assassination. Sunnī opponents are described as:

> people of discord and hypocrisy. The tyrants and the oppressors…O people who simply cling to the literal meaning of the Qurʾān…O

[377] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār*, x.
[378] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār*, x.

you who are deprived of the truth…O dirty and filthy people.[379]

Al-Mufīd

Abū ʿAbdullāh Muḥammad al-Harīthī al-Baghdādī, who was known both as al-Mufīd and Ibn al-Muʿallim, was born in 336/948 in Ukbara, a small town near Baghdād. His agnomen, Ibn al-Muʿallim is thought to originate from his father being a teacher in Wāsit, to the southeast of Baghdād. His first teacher was Abū ʿAbdullāh al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-Baṣrī (d. 369/979), [380] the prominent Muʿtazilī scholar. Al-Mufīd then studied under Abū Yāsir, a Shīʿī theologian who was a student of Abū al-Jaysh al-Muẓaffar b. Muḥammad al-Khersānī (d. 367/977). He then joined the circle of Abū Jaysh.[381] Al-Mufīd continued to study under the renowned grammarian, logician and linguist, ʿAlī b. ʿĪsa al-Rummānī (d. 384/993). He was a student of Ibn Babawayh al-Qummī, the 4th century teacher of jurisprudence. Al-Mufīd would later teach al-Shaykh al-Murtaḍā. The author of 170 treatises,[382] he would become one of the main figures of the Imāmīs. Al-Mufīd was viewed as the bridge between the rational and the traditionalist schools. Intellectual activity in the Būyid period of rule in Iraq and Persia would offer him the freedom to write, discuss and elaborate on his theological positions. [383]

---

[379] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār*, xi.
[380] ʿAbd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad Asadābādī, *Farāq wa-ṭabaqāt al-muʿtazilah* (Cairo: Dār al-Ṭibāʿah al-Jāmiʿīyah, 1972), 113.
[381] Al-Najāshī contends that Abū Jaysh was a student of Abū Sahl al-Nawbakhtī. He was a major Shīʿī theologian. Al-Najāshī discusses how al-Mufīd began his studies under Ṣāḥir, a student of Abū Jaysh. Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Najāshī, *Rijāl al-Najāshī* (Beirut: Dār al-Adwāʾ, 1988), vol. 1, 374 and vol. 2, 374.
[382] al-Mufīd, *Kitāb al-Irshād*, Preface by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, xvii.
[383] T. Bayhom-Daou, *Shaykh Mufīd: Makers of the Muslim World* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005).

The thought-provoking persona of al-Mufīd can be seen in his first encounter with al-Rummānī. It was his first day in class. A man from Baṣra asked a question regarding the events of al-Ghadīr and al-Ghār. Al-Rummānī replied that 'Al-Ghadīr is a report (*riwāyah*) whereas the event of al-Ghār is a matter of solid knowledge (*dirāyah*). A report cannot necessitate what is necessitated by solid knowledge' in relation to the personalities who took part in these events. The questioner did not reply and accepted the answer. Al-Mufīd did not agree with the answer. He asked al-Rummānī, 'What is your judgement about someone who fights against a just Imām'? Al-Rummānī said that he would be classified as a *kāfir* (unbeliever) then corrected himself by stating that the he would be a *fāsiq* (grave sinner).[384] Al-Mufīd then asked, 'What do you think of the Commander of the Faithful ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib'? He replied that ʿAlī is 'an Imām'. Al-Mufīd then asked, 'What do you say about Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr and the Battle of the Camel'? Al-Rummānī said, 'They repented'. The same logic was then applied when he replied, saying, 'The event of the Camel is a matter of solid knowledge (*dirāyah*) whereas their repentance is a report (*riwāyah*)'. This aroused interest from al-Rummānī towards al-Mufīd whom he sent to Abū ʿAbdillāh al-Baṣrī[385] with a sealed letter, where the title al-Mufīd,[386] the beneficial, was bestowed upon him. McDermott, however, questions this story on the basis that it is narrated in different ways, with various times and

[384] The term *fāsiq* is used here in a Muʿtazilī sense, designating a degree of belief. According to the Muʿtazila, the *fāsiq* has an intermediate state between belief (*īmān*) and disbelief (*kufr*). As a Qurʾānic term, the *fāsiq* is the 'one who violates the command of Allāh by commiting a grave sin'. Ibrahīm al-Sāmarrāʾī, *Fī al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Islāmī* (Beirut: Dār al-Hadīthah, 1990), 28.
[385] This indicates that al-Mufīd continued to attend the lessons of al-Baṣrī while studying under Abū Yāssir.
[386] Ibn Shahrāshūb argues that he was given this name by the twelfth Imām. See Rashīd al-Dīn Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Ibn Shahrāshūb, *Kitāb Maʿālim al-ʿUlamāʾ* (Ṭehrān: Maṭbaʿat Fardīn, 1934), 113.

personalities in question.[387] He cites a version of the story taking place in the circle of Q□□□ □Abd al-Jabb□r but this is improbable first because □Abd al-Jabb□r was about the same age as al-Muf□d and secondly none of al-Muf□d□s biographers have listed □Abd al-Jabb□r as one of his teachers.

After a generation of Qumm□'s, al-Muf□d became the leading Im□m□ scholar in various religious sciences. They had shunned engagement in *kal□m*, instead relying heavily on the *□ad□ths* of the Prophet and the Im□ms. There was little critique of the authenticity of the narrations. It was al-Muf□d who elaborated on the concept of *naz□r*, theological investigation, deeming it mandatory within Sh□□□ theology.

> Whoever advocates the abandonment of *naz□r* admits his own weakness of mind and reveals his deficiency in knowledge…because straying away from *naz□r* leads to reprehensible emulation.[388]

He was titled *al-Mutakallim*. Theological questions would come from places such as □abarist□n, D□navar, Gurg□n and M□zandar□n which al-Muf□d would address within his treatise. He would actively encourage those who were qualified to engage in polemics and disputation (*mun□□arah*).[389]

This theological investigation was continued by al-Murta□□. Al-Muf□d would further discuss the relationship between Sh□□□ theology and Mu□tazilite thought as well as analyse the works of earlier Sh□□□ theologians such as Shaykh al-□ad□q.[390] Al-Muf□d

[387] Martin J. McDermott, *The Theology of Shaykh al-Muf□d* (Beirut, 1978), 10.
[388] Ab□ Abdull□h Mu□ammad b. Mu□ammad al-Muf□d, *Taṣḥ□h al-i□tiq□d* (Qum, 1951), 203.
[389] Al-Muf□d, *Taṣḥ□h al-i□tiq□d,* 202-3.
[390] Ab□ Abdull□h Mu□ammad b. Mu□ammad al-Muf□d, *Shar□ □aq□□id al-□ad□q* (Beirut: D□r al-Kit□b al-Isl□m□, 1983).

was also dedicated to discussions of the position of the Imāms and would specialise in the collection and analysis of *ḥadīth*. These discussions were compiled in *Awāʾil al-maqālāt fī-l-madhāhib al-mukhtārāt; al-Irshād fī maʿrifat ḥujaj Allāh ʿalal-ʿibād; al-Fuṣūl al ʿashara fī al-ghaibah; al-Fuṣūl al-mukhtāra min al-ʿUyūn wal-maḥāsin; al-Ifṣāḥ fī Imāmat ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib; al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* and *al-Jamal, aw al-nuṣrah fī ḥarb al-Baṣrah; Khams rasāʾil fī ithbāt al-ḥujjah* and *al- Thaqalayn: al-Kitāb wal-ʿitrah*.

Awāʾil al-maqālāt is viewed as a theological treatise with its own order. The introduction highlights al-Mufīd's intentions in writing the work. He wrote the book acting upon a request from the chief of the descendants of Imām ʿAlī, al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, or from al-Sharīf's father, Abū Aḥmad al-Ḥusayn b. Mūsa al-Mūsawī. It is divided into three parts; the first part discusses the differences between the Imāmī and the Muʿtazilī, amongst other groups; the second section is a discussion on the subject of such pillars of the faith as God's Unity, Prophecy, Imāmate and the third part which discusses various miscellaneous issues within theological discussions.[391] Not only is it an exposition of Shīʿī doctrines, but it can also be classified under the genre of *firaq* literature - literature which examines different Islamic sects and factions. The book begins with a number of definitions. In referring to the Shīʿa, he says that they are:

> the followers of the Commander of the Faithful, Allāh's blessings be upon him, i.e., Imām ʿAlī, in the way of executive allegiance (*al-walāʾ*) and the belief in his Imāmate after the Prophet, Allāh's blessings be upon him and his family, without a doubt, as well as the rejection of the Imāmate of those prior to him in the

[391] McDermott, *The Theology of Shaykh al-Mufīd*, 50.

position of the caliphate.

The definition excludes the people of Ba□ra and those who participated in the Battle of the Camel, Mu□□wiya's partisans and the Khaw□rij.

Al-B□qill□n□

The judge Ab□ Bakr Mu□ammad b. al-□ayyib b. Mu□ammad Ja□far b. al-Q□sim al-B□qill□n□. In some sources he is known as Ibn al-B□qill□n□. An Ash□□rite theologian and a M□lik□ jurisprudent instrumental in conveying an understanding of the basis of Ash□□rite thought. His date of birth is unknown, but he is known to have died on 23 Dh□l Qa□da 403/5 June 1013. Al-B□qill□n□ was born in Ba□ra, but lived for many years in Baghd□d. He studied under disciples of al-Ash□□r□ and achieved fame for his own lectures which attracted many students. Only six of his works are known to be extant.[392] The earliest of these is the theological polemic known as *al-Tam□□d.*[393] The work is a refutation of the Sh□□□s, Kh□rij□s and Mu□tazil□s. The *Man□qib*[394] also survives, although it is incomplete. Both texts discuss the Sunn□ position regarding Im□mate and caliphate.[395] The *Man□qib* is seen as an earlier work than the *Tam□□d*, as it is referenced within the *Tam□□d,* although the exact date is unclear.[396] The second volume of the *Man□qib* discusses Im□mate in general and the Im□mate of □Al□ in particular.

---

[392] R.J. McCarthy, "Al-B□qill□n□", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, vol. 1, 958-59.
[393] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tamh□d*.
[394] Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ṭayyib al-B□qill□n□, *Man□qib al-aʿimmah al-arbaʿah,* ed. Sam□ra Farhat (Beirut: D□r al-Muntakhab al-ʿArab□, 2002).
[395] Al-B□qill□n□, *Man□qib*.
[396] Al-B□qill□n□, *Man□qib,* Introduction by Sam□ra Farhat, 17.

The Mu□tazil□s were still influential when al-B□qill□n□ was writing. The reaction against the Mu□tazil□s, beginning with Ibn □anbal, was developed by the Sunn□ *kal□m* movement, which was concerned with scholastic theology. Ibn Khald□n defined *kal□m* as:

> A science which furnished the means to prove the dogmas of the faith by rational arguments and to refute innovators, who, in matters which concern beliefs, depart from the doctrine followed by the ancients and the traditionists.[397]

Furthermore, although the Kh□rij□s were not as strong as they had been in the early period of the caliphate and its dissensions, the memory of their extremist tendencies in destabilizing the state, as well as building independent Im□mates, would lead to their refutation with al-B□qill□n□'s works. The Kh□rij□s had now ceased to be active in S□st□n and attempts to build a base in North Africa under an □Ib□ḍ□ state were also unsuccessful.[398] The Shīʿī remained a major force. The Fāṭimid caliphate had been established in North Africa in 297/910 and was seeking an extension to its already growing influence. Two emirates, the Būyids of western Persia and the Ḥamd□nids of Maw□il and Aleppo were also under the influence of Sh□□□ thought. Therefore, al-B□qill□n□'s work was written at a period when the political unity of the Muslim world, according to Lambton, 'had been fragmented beyond repair'.[399]

Conclusion

[397] Ibn Khald□n, *Muqaddimah* (Cairo, 1321), quoted by L. Gardet and M.M. Anawati in *Introduction à La Théologie Musulmane* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1948), 309.
[398] A. Lambton, *State and Government in Medieval Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), 71.
[399] Lambton, *State and Government in Medieval Islam*, 71.

In this chapter, we have conducted a survey of the sources from different genres of literature from the 3rd to the 6th centuries AH/9th to the 12th centuries CE. This study will seek to use written sources dating from the 3rd/9th century to reconstruct the early debates on the caliphate of Mu□□wiya. The usage of different sources of literature is known as the inter-textual approach and will help provide a more thorough understanding of Mu□□wiya's caliphate and leadership than simply using one genre of literature such as historical source material. Sections discussing the merits of the caliphs are fully developed and can be seen in *□ad□th* works from the renowned compilers, from the 2nd/8th century in their rudimentary forms.[406] These sections were not accidental and do not emerge spontaneously. The *Man□qib* traditions of the 3rd/9th century, as an example, display a common *topoi* and shared vocabulary which reveals an earlier origin of both oral and written transmission. [407] Not only does Motzki's work reveals that the majority of traditions in □Abd al-Razz□q's *Muṣannaf* can be dated to the end of the 1st/7th century,[408] but Speight's study of *□ad□th* variants also concludes that there was 'a two and a half centuries-long enterprise, to the compilations of Ibn □anbal, al-Bukh□r□ and Muslim, of intense cultivation of the memory of the Prophet by fertile minds, who successively reconstituted the material of memory in disciplined, but also imaginative ways'.[409] Previous studies sought to examine

[406] Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates*, 35-67.
[407] See A. Gorke, "The Historical Tradition about al-Hudayb□yya", in *The Biography of Mu□ammad: The Issue of the Sources*, ed. Harald Motzki (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 267.
[408] H. Motzki, "The *Muṣannaf* of □Abd al-Razz□q b. □amm□m al-San□□n□ as a Source of Authentic *A□ad□th* of the First Century AH", 1-21.
[409] M. Speight, "A Look at Variant Readings in the *□□d□th"*, *Der Islam*, 77 (2000), 179.

Mu□□wiya's biography using historical sources alone.[410] This range of sources would help to shed further light on his period of rule. They would examine his leadership by studying key decisions that he made as a governor as well as the head of the community. However, they would only be able to give a conclusion on his character without being able to claim that they had dissected and deployed a wide variety of sources from other genres of literature. This study will contribute to the field of Islamic history by discussing the caliphate of Mu□□wiya from historical, theological, jurisprudential and belles-lettres Islamic literature, an examination which has not previously been undertaken. This model would not only be vital in examining Mu□□wiya's leadership, but could also be used to help understand the main debates that took place concerning leadership in the nascent Islamic community.

[410] For example, M. A. Shaban, *Islamic History: A New Interpretation,* vol. 1; R. S. Humphreys, *Mu□□wiya ibn Ab□ Sufy□n* and K. Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya.*

Chapter 3

Leadership and Authority in Classical Islam

Introduction

The beginning of the prophethood of Muḥammad marked the emergence of a charismatic leader and the establishment of his own personal authority in contrast to traditional Arab hierarchy. A unique historical situation emerged after his death, with the question arising as to how this charismatic authority was to continue. Weber defined charisma as 'a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional qualities'.[411]

Prophet Muḥammad's charismatic legacy was the most dominant force to become active after his death and 'it's strong propensity to be established permanently. As Weber recognized, if a charismatic movement is not to be a passing phase in the traditional mode of a given society, then it seeks to imprint itself permanently on its historical course'.[412]

---

[411] Max Weber, *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*, ed. S.N. Eisenstadt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), xviii.
[412] See Dabashi, *Authority in Islam*, 1

This characteristic movement would prove vital in all domains of life, public and private. It seeks to perpetuate the orders of authority. This is similar to what Weber discusses under the theory of routinization. However, this term may be seen as problematic particularly when examining the 'diversity of modes in which Mu□ammad's charismatic authority was sought to be institutionalized; and second, in the particular case of the Sh□'ites, which was essentially an attempt towards the perpetuation of this mode of authority'.[413]

Furthermore, in order to understand whether this charismatic authority continues to exert itself within society, there needs to be a recognition of three key areas. Firstly, there needs to be an understanding of the importance of the qualities and attributes of the charismatic figure. Secondly, the relationship that existed between the charismatic figure and the source of legitimation. Thirdly, the relation between the charismatic figure and his followers. This hierarchial structure, in the case of Islam, could be seen in the relationship between All□h and Mu□ammad and between Mu□ammad the messenger and the nascent Islamic community. All□h's omnipotence was placed alongside Mu□ammad's charismatic authority and above the community. This can be seen in the following Qur□□nic verse:[414]

> Say: 'O men! I am sent unto you all, as the Messenger of All□h, to Whom belongeth the dominion of the heavens and the earth: there is no god but He: it is He That giveth both life and death. So believe in All□h and His Messenger, the Unlettered Prophet, who believeth in All□h and His words: follow him that ye may be guided'.

[413] Dabashi, *Authority in Islam*, 2.
[414] *The Qur□□n* 7:158.

Therefore, through Prophetic messengership, All□h's omnipotence was transferred into the comprehensive authority of Mu□ammad. However, this complex relationship would weigh heavily on understanding modes of authority in the post-Prophetic period.[415] When examining what would later be termed Sunn□ Islam, 'there are pressures for the institutional preservation and continuation of the faith as the prophet's legacy'.[416] Mu□ammad's death could be seen, within Sunn□ Islam, as marking the end of a charismatic era. This era was to be placed in the background, simply as a source of reference for the Muslim community to revert to in order to ensure a more stable daily routine. However, in what would later be known as Sh□□□ Islam, an attempt was made to preserve and institutionalize the Prophet's charismatic authority. Islam was viewed as the ultimate monotheistic religion by □Al□ and his disciples. Amongst these followers, there was a 'persistent propensity to maintain and uphold the sanctity and universality of Islam as well as a growing tendency to encapsulate and preserve the very charismatic ambience experienced during the lifetime of the Prophet. This made the post-Mu□ammadan development of Sh□□ite Islam, in all its dimensions and magnitudes, an episode in the perpetuation of charisma, not its routinization. The Sh□□'ite Imams constituted genuine charismatic figures with all the particularities of Weberian typology'.[417] This would therefore lead to a recognition of □Al□ as the political, spiritual and religious leader of the Islamic community vis-a-vis a strong resistance to the traditional Arab elements who sought to obtain authority without holding onto the Qur□□n and the attributes of the charismatic figure of Prophet Mu□ammad.

[415] Dabashi, *Authority in Islam*, 2.
[416] Dabashi, *Authority in Islam*, 3.
[417] Dabashi, *Authority in Islam*, 5.

The concept of authority in Islam may be defined as the right or legitimate claim to obedience. This may be seen in 4:59 of the Qur□□n, which says: 'O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you'.[418] Those in authority is translated as *'ulu'l-□Amr'*. An indication is given that *□Amr* is referring to those who are entitled to command. The Qur□□n, it may be argued, does not provide a referent term. The Sunn□tes and the Sh□□a both agree that the caliph or Im□m is entitled to obedience as commanded in this verse, however they differ over who the rightful caliph is.[419] Furthermore, in this early period, and within the discussions concerning authority, other terms emerge which seek to discuss temporal power. *Mulk,* as an example, was a form of temporal rule, although a contrast was clearly made between divine and human kingship, which may be seen to have delegitimized the latter, where 'to God belongs the kingdom (*mulk*) of the heavens and the earth'.[420] It may be argued that the term *sult□n*[421] emerged to replace the word *mulk* in denoting legitimate political authority. It was a term that was employed by the Umayyad caliphs, and can be seen in 1st/7th century Egyptian papyri for the governor.[422] Al-Mans□r would later declare himself as 'the authority of God on His earth' (*Sult□n All□h fi ardhih□*).[423]

This chapter seeks to discuss classical Islamic conceptions of

---

[418] *The Qur'□n*, tr. □Abdull□h Y□suf □Al□.
[419] S. Arjomand, "Authority and Political Culture in Sh□'ism'', 1.
[420] Qur'□n, 2:107; The verse is repeated on twelve occasions, see H. E. Kassis, *A Concordance of the Qur'□n* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1983), 766-767.
[421] H. E. Kassis, *A Concordance of the Qur'□n*, 1081-1082.
[422] T. W. Arnold, *The Caliphate* (New York : Barnes and Noble, 1966 [1924]), 202-203.
[423] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph,* 85.

leadership and authority and will accomplish that through an analytical survey of the major genres of writing, including theology, history and *adab*. It will seek to examine the debates concerning leadership in early Islam as well as discussing how different theological positions developed concerning the nature of authority. The debates based on the qualities and attributes of the leader of the Muslim community are the earliest debates in Islamic society based on the sources that have survive. In these debates the main themes emerge discussing the importance of *ʿilm* (knowledge) and *shujāʿa* (courage). However, there is little mention of *ḥilm* (self-control). The function of this chapter is to examine the properties of leadership posited in these sources in order to then analyse whether Muʿāwiya as presented in these sources fulfills these properties using the inter-textual approach.

Adab Sources

Al-Jāḥiẓ

To al-Jāḥiẓ, an Imām is a necessity. The Imām acts as a guide to the people, both politically and spiritually. The community cannot be left to their own devices and schemes. If they could, God would not have seen the need to send messengers as exemplars:

> For spiritual understanding stems from worldy understanding; but whereas the latter is manifest, or nearly so, the former is occult, and is so to be attained only through great virtue and unremitting effort, assisted by the teachings of the Imāms. Were men able of themselves to obtain all that related to their material and spiritual life, there would be little point or

advantage of God sending Prophets.[424]

Knowledge of the *shari□ah*, the legal issues that arise and the way they are to be interpreted can only be understood through an Im□m who has the knowledge to dissect what has been revealed:

> If men, using that which is manifest, preferring that which is lasting, seeking to better themselves, needing an adequate pittance and aware that therein lies the salvation, cannot of themselves understand and arrange all this, though knowledge of these things is clear and manifest and their causes follow one from another, how much more will they be unable to distinguish *ta'w□l* from *tajw□r*, to understand the importance of exegesis, the science of the transmission of traditions, and the foundations of the faith. This being so, we appreciate that men need an Im□m to teach them what befits them, and we recognize three kinds of Im□m; messengers, prophets and Im□ms.[425]

To al-J□□i□, it is in the public's interest that there is an Im□m who puts order to what may otherwise be a community of much disorder. Furthermore, al-J□□i□ recognizes the importance of valor in the criteria for leadership. However, he seeks to refute the Sh□□□ praise of □Al□'s greatness on the battlefield. He acknowledges □Al□'s merits on the battlefield but stresses that such a quality can be seen in the biographies of the likes of al-Zubayr b. al-Aww□m and al-Bar□' b. M□lik.[426] He further states that the Prophet himself mentioned Ukkash b. Mihsan as the best warrior among the Arabs. Moreover, if courage on the battlefield infers automatic merit, then, to al-J□□i□, these men should be placed above the Prophet, for he was known to have

[424] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□,* 63-4.
[425] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□,* 64.
[426] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□,* 82.

killed only one man in war.[427] Whether the greatest was ʿAlī or not, this passage once again highlights the importance of courage on the battlefield in discussions concerning leadership in the early Islamic discourses.

The Imām is seen as the reflection of the Prophet in his moral conduct as well as his intelligence. In contrast to ʿAbd al-Jabbār, and in agreement with al-Mufīd, he has to be the best of the community. Any other appointment, of one who has faults, is an insult to the Prophet. However, such a man may have faults, and therefore the absolute nature of infallibility is not agreed upon, but he must be the best of those who surround him:

> If we are asked what is the image of the best? We reply: His most marked trait should be his intelligence; his intellectual ability should go hand in hand with a lively intellectual curiosity and wide erudition; and these qualities should be associated with good habits. When learning is allied to intellect, energy to learning and decisiveness to energy, there is no need to look further. It may happen that a man who in some respects falls short of the ideal is worthy of the office of the Imām and the rank of Caliph, but he must be the best of his contemporaries. Respect for God's messenger requires that only men as like him as possible should in each age occupy the position that he held. To put someone in his place who was unlike him and did not follow in his footsteps would be to insult his memory. The Imām is like the messenger only to the extent that he models his conduct on his. As for equalling him, that is impossible, and not within the bounds of hopes and prayers.[428]

It is the duty of the people to ensure that an Imām is in place

[427] Pellat, *The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ,* 82.
[428] Pellat, *The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ,* 65-66.

to guide them in their affairs, both political and spiritual. There can only be one Im□m. If there is more than one Im□m, it will cause disunity. This one Im□m is designated through the choice of the people. Once appointed, he is to be obeyed. This obedience brings stability to the people. Al-J□□i□ recognises that within human nature, there are groups of people who will try to gain ascendancy or affect who holds the office, but an Im□m must be in a position to alleviate such dilemmas.

> We are commanded to remove the causes of disorder as far as possible, and to look after the common people to the best of our ability; and it is therefore our duty to establish a single Im□m, since otherwise, as we have said, men are quick to evil when they have a mind to it and to flight when they are afraid. This is a fact confirmed by simple observation and shown by experience. But we say: It is not right that the government of the Muslims according to the dictates of reason, firmness and prudence, should be entrusted to more than one person, for rulers and chieftains, when they are of comparable merit and similar aims, are greatly tempted to try and gain ascendancy, and their rivalry increases.[429]

The Prophet did not designate any leader. Al-J□□i□ does not doubt that it would have been preferable if he did, but the fact that he did not was an indication that there were other ways to choose the leader. The Im□m may be appointed in a number of ways. The first is through election, in the way Ab□ Bakr was chosen at Saq□fa, upon the agreement of the emigrants and the helpers, whom according to al-J□□i□:

> were Muslims who had known each other intimately for 23 years, so that Ab□ Bakr's merits were immediately obvious to them, on the

[429] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□,* 64-5.

> Prophet's death they had no need to form their own opinions since they already knew…..[430]

Furthermore, the Im□m may be chosen by the previous Im□m or by *sh□r□*, in the way □Umar appointed six people to preside over the Caliph who was to succeed him. □Al□, to al-J□□i□ was not designated by the Prophet, and was of less merit than Ab□ Bakr. If his merits were his exploits at war, this, to al-J□□i□, is not proof of his ability or his designation:

> If slaying great numbers of the enemy and charging repeatedly with drawn sword were the severest of ordeals and the most thankless of tasks, if this were the best criterion of the fitness of commands, then □Al□, al-Zubair would have ot be considered more deserving than the Prophet and more exposed to suffering and misery for Mu□ammad only killed one man with his own hand.[431]

Furthermore, the verse in chapter four of the Qur□□n, which at the time was the Sh□'ite claim for the designation and obedience of □Al□ and his lineage, was refuted by al-J□□i□, stating that the:

> *□ad□th* on which this interpretation rests does not fulfil these conditions or fit this description. Indeed, the commentators suggests that it refers rather to the Prophet's officers and governors, to Muslims in general, or to leaders of military expeditions…And that it is an injunction to the people to obey the commanders of the army and submit to the civil administration.[432]

---

[430] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□,* 82.
[431] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□,* 74.
[432] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□,* 76.

Abū Bakr was called the *Ṣiddīq*, the truthful. His conversion was of great merit. He was one of the wealthiest men in Arabia, a man of prestige, lineage and nobility. He sacrificed what he owned, as well as his friends and allies, to join Muḥammad. None can compare to this:

> The worthies of Mecca used to meet at his house to enjoy the pleasure of his conversation and his remarkable knowledge of poetry…He would choose the topic of conversation, and detain his guests by plying them with honey, raisins and milk…There is little in common between the conversion of a rich man on the one hand, who sacrifices the best part of his wealth, sees his influence dwindle and his bosom friends desert him, forgoes the power of wealth and the pleasure of having many friends, and lapses into mortifying loneliness and miserable poverty, and that of a dull useless wretch, a seeker rather than a bestower of friendship and favour on the other.[433]

The question arises, however, as to the confusion that seemed to surround Abū Bakr and ʿUmar at the time of the Prophet's death. To al-Jāḥiẓ, this is very logical when examining the circumstances. There were many splinter groups that had emerged. Some were seeking their own interests and ensuring they were fulfilled, others were hypocrites who had surrounded Muḥammad, others were zealous people who had converted but without much knowledge and others were simply laymen who knew nothing of the importance of a successor to Muḥammad's rule. Abū Bakr had to deal with all of these different groups, and interestingly admits, 'I am at your head, but I am not the best of you', a statement which al-Jāḥiẓ has to defend to maintain the concept of the best of the contemporaries ruling over the people.[434]

[433] Pellat, *The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ,* 73.
[434] Pellat, *The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ,* 77-8.

Al-Tawḥīdī

Al-Tawḥīdī discussed the crucial events in Islamic history including the succession to the Prophet Muḥammad, the killing of ʿUthmān, the Battle of Ṣiffīn, the emergence of the Umayyad dynasty and the killing of al-Ḥusayn. His vision of these events would, to a large extent, shape his opinions concerning the Shīʿa in general and the Imāmīs in particular. Importantly, he rejects the opinion that the Prophet chose ʿAlī as his successor. This he demonstrates by narrating the statement of ʿUmar, son of ʿAlī, 'We did not hear about the appointment (*waṣīya*) until we went to Iraq'.[435]

Furthermore, he comments on the well known narration of ʿĀʾisha - 'The Prophet died between my breast and my throat, so when did he appoint him'? - by saying that 'it is as if she means ʿAlī'.[436] Moreover, without citing any authority, he discusses a long and unique narration where ʿAbbās, uncle of both Muḥammad and ʿAlī, asks ʿAlī why he did not ask the Prophet about the matter of the caliphate. ʿAlī, however, refuses and is asked by al-Qaʿqaʿ b. ʿAmr why he refused. He replied:

> because if we asked him and he appointed a person not from us, it would never revert back to us. So I wished to remain silent, if he gave us the Successorship, then this would be what we want; but if he gave it to other than us, our hope to attain it would remain extended, and neither we nor the people would be severed from that hope.[437]

---

[435] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, vol. 7, 53.
[436] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, vol. 7, 74-75.
[437] Al-Tawḥīdī, *Kitāb al-imtāʿ wa-al-muʾānasah*, vol. 1, 16-18.

Al-Tawḥīdī sees the election of Abū Bakr at Saqīfah as being legitimate. He disagrees completely with the stance of the Anṣār in the event, who wanted a rotation and duality in leadership of the Muslim community. He narrates that it was ʿAlī who had rejected the Anṣār's position.[438] In his *Risālat al-Saqīfah*, he concludes that ʿAlī was wrong in not giving his pledge of allegiance to Abū Bakr. Although he wrote the work, he attributes it to those figures who were contemporaneous with what happened at Saqīfah. However, its 4th/10th century composition and unique Tawḥīdian style is quite apparent.[439] The four main figures involved at Saqīfah are Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, Abū Ubaydah b. al-Jarrāḥ and ʿAlī.

ʿAlī has acknowledged the leadership of Abū Bakr and has created a problem which they are seeking to remedy. The context of the discussion is interesting as Tawḥīdī set the stage by describing how one night he and his colleagues were at the house of Abū Ḥamīd al-Marwarudhī (d. 362/972), the Shāfiʿī jurist and al-Tawḥīdī's mentor, in Baghdād. When the incident of Saqīfah was being discussed, his mentor asked the students as to how much they knew about the claimants and the defendants in this case. They replied in the negative. He then states that apart from the vizier al-Muhallabī, he had not narrated the incident in its entirety to anyone. He comments that al-Muhallabī was shocked at what he heard and found it revealing.[440]

Chains of authoritities were provided by al-Mawarudhī, which would narrate over two and a half centuries, all ending with Abū

[438] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, vol. 5, 99.
[439] *Risālat al-Saqīfah* by Abū ʿAyyān ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Tawḥīdī published in I. al-Kīlānī, ed., *Thalāth rasāʾil li-Abī Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī* (Damascus, 1951), 5-26.
[440] Al-Tawḥīdī, *Risālat al-Saqīfah,* 6.

Ubaydah b. al-Jarrā. For example, he narrates that when Abū Ubaydah went to give ʿAlī the message of pledging allegiance, ʿUmar stopped him and gave him his own message to give to ʿAlī:

> What was this attitude of megalomania, uptightness and rancor he was exhibiting? The Prophet had passed away without saying anything about the matter of the caliphate, without seeking the assistance of revelation about it, and without passing a pronouncement on ʿAlī concerning it. And, after all, we are not to act in the style of the Chosroes nor of the Caesars, rather we are guided by the light of prophecy, message, wisdom, mercy and a guided community which is entrusted with the truth and secured from being rended and mended.[441]

Furthermore, al-Tawwāḍī does not absolve or defend ʿAlī when examining the killing of ʿUthmān. He uses the term 'transgressors' to describe the Muslims who killed him.[442] Although he blames the people of Medīna and the Anṣār for deserting ʿUthmān, his main attack on ʿAlī is for his failure to support the caliph in his most difficult period.[443] He narrates an incident where ʿUthmān is seemingly aware that ʿAlī will have a role in his killing. Implicitly, it may be argued, that al-Tawwāḍī lay the blame on ʿAlī for the killing of ʿUthmān. He even quotes the Kūfan judge of the 2nd/8th century Sharik b. ʿAbdullāh, who believed that ʿAlī was always conscious of his role in the killing of ʿUthmān.[444]

However, he does leave room for ʿAlī to reply to such accusations. He narrates ʿAlī's conclusion about ʿUthmān that he was known for his excessive 'misappropriation of power which

[441] Al-Tawwāḍī, *Risālat al-Saqīfah*, 17.
[442] Al-Tawwāḍī, *Kitāb al-imtāʿ wa-al-muʾānasah*, vol. 3, 200.
[443] Al-Tawwāḍī, *Kitāb al-imtāʿ wa-al-muʾānasah*, vol. 3, 165-169.
[444] Al-Tawwāḍī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, vol. 5, 215.

produced excessive anxiety among us'.[445]

To al-Tawḥīdī, the past is distant and problematic and one cannot precisely conclude as to what happened.[446] Al-Tawḥīdī's position on the Battle of the Camel is not so clear, with the only possible insight taken from his citing of the tradition that ʿĀʾisha would choke before dying remembering her stances in the battle.[447]

Theological Sources

Sālim b. Dhakwān

There is little controversy when discussing the caliphates of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar and the way they were elected into office. Election precedes designation. However, Abū Bakr is viewed as being the man of the greatest merit amongst the Muslim community after the Prophet, this being a vital characteristic in the characteristics of an Imām.

> So they made their choice, in the interest of their religion and for their own sake, strictly from among those who were closest among them to God and distinguished by justice and trsutworthiness. God guided them to success in choosing the man most outstanding among them in practising the faith, the one best tried in Godliness, and the oldest companion of the Messenger of God, whom he had accompanied in the cave after they both left Mecca as emigrants to God - Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq - and him they appointed as Caliph. He took the Qurʾān as an Imām, followed the *sunnah* of God's Prophet,and knew that when he would meet his

[445] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, vol. 3 106.
[446] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, vol. 3, 173.
[447] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣāʾir wa-al-dhakhāʾir*, vol. 7, 51.

> Lord, who had put him in charge of the Community of Muḥammad, may God's blessings and peace be upon him, He would question him about the state in which he had left it.[448]

ʿUmar is viewed as being appointed by Abū Bakr. [449] An election is not held. ʿUmar faces the task of having to exercise judgements in:

> cases which were not covered by Qurʾānic pronouncements or prior *sunnah*, whether received from the messenger of God, may God's blessings be upon him, or instituted by Abū Bakr.[450]

However, to Sālim, ʿUmar is to be obeyed according to the Qurʾānic injunction which he narrates from chapter 4:59. ʿUmar's method of consulation while Imām is praised and is viewed as a reflection of chapter 3:159 of the Qurʾān. The caliph's knowledge is binding in the opinion of Sālim and is a reflection of the teachings of the Qurʾān. However, there is a shift in the way the caliphate is examined when discussing ʿUthmān and ʿAlī. ʿUthmān was good:

> For as long as God wished, he continued to act in accordance with the Book of God and the *sunnah* of the Prophet. But then he lost sight of the next world and succumbed to this worldly ambitions, which led him to change the *sunnah* and introduce arbitary innovations.[451]

ʿUthmān's nepotism, mistreatment of companions and squandering of public wealth are attacked, with many examples analysed.

---

[448] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sālim b. Dhakwān*, 77.
[449] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sālim b. Dhakwān*, 77.
[450] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sālim b. Dhakwān*, 79.
[451] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sālim b. Dhakwān*, 79.

> He dismissed companions of the Messenger of God who understood the Book and the *Sunnah* and appointed foolish relatives of his who were young of age, insensitive to the truth, and ignorant of many precedents set by the Prophet, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Those are amongst the countless sins ʿUthmān committed by following his own whim instead of judging rightfully.[452]

Importantly, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar's actions are now seen as *sunnah* as well as precedent according to Sulaym. He states this very ideal when discussing ʿAlī:

> Then the Muslims paid allegiance to ʿAlī having taken a promise from him that he would act in accordance with the Book of God and follow the precedents set by their Prophet and the two caliphs after him.[453]

Rising against the caliph of their time, Ṭalḥa and Zubayr 'violated their right not to be attacked by fellow Muslims and tore the veil of Islam by charging towards them and starting to fight them'.[454]

God, however, is viewed as having helped the Muslims defeat Ṭalḥa and Zubayr. Muʿāwiya is also viewed as violating his right and obedience to the caliph of the time. Justification for rising against a caliph can only be given if the caliph judges by other than God's commands, especially in a case already judged by God. This was the crime of ʿAlī according to Sulaym.

> Then ʿAlī abandoned the path the Muslims had followed in the past by making somebody other than God the judge in a case already settled by God. God says, 'And God shall decide justly, and those

[452] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sulaym b. Dhakwān*, 83.
[453] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sulaym b. Dhakwān*, 91.
[454] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sulaym b. Dhakwān*, 93.

> that they call on, apart from Him, shall not decide by any means; surely God is the All-Hearing; the All-Seeing' (40:20).[455]

ʿAlī is described as 'making a mockery of God's judgement' and therefore had to be desposed according to Khārijite thought. An Imām was fallible. A caliph was to be deposed, if he was not adhering to God's judgements. The Muslim had a duty, to live with God as the sole judge of all human affairs. If an Imām was opposing God's judgement then a group would have to rise. The method of rising would be described.

> Namely, to fight God's enemy and theirs (60:1) till he perished or God's religion prevailed, then they deposed him and went out to fight, making the Qurʾān their judge, satisfied with the judgement of God, who is the best of judges (10:109) and separating from ʿAlī because he was rejecting the judgement of God and accepting the judgement of a man he used to declare an infidel and an enemy of God. They gave up all desire for this life and its pleasure and sold themselves out of desire for the approval of God (2:207). Then the Khārijite Muslims followed one another, adhering to that way. They would make God their sole judge and accept the path of Muslims who had gone before them. They would not kill the offspring of their *qawm* (people) or hold sexual intercourse with their women to be lawful.[456]

Al-Ashʿarī

Al-Ashʿarī states that the first disagreement in Islamic history related to Imāmate and the succession of the Prophet Muḥammad. The event of Saqīfah is described as being central to the appointment of Abū Bakr as caliph, a conclusion to discussions

[455] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sālim b. Dhakwān*, 93.
[456] Crone and Zimmerman, "Epistle 2" in *The Epistle of Sālim b. Dhakwān*, 97.

held with the Anṣār of Medīna. He concludes that the community obeyed Abū Bakr as caliph and the only opposition faced by Abū Bakr was that of the apostates in the Riddah movement.[457] Imāmate being defined in different ways led to the formation of splinter groups, amongst them the Rafiḍites, who he defines as:

> those who rejected the caliphate of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, who believe that ʿAlī was designated by the Prophet Muḥammad, who believe that most of the companions went astray after not taking him as their leader, who believe that Imāmate is a designated position, who believe that an Imām can dissimulate his beliefs, who believe that the Imām is the most excellent of the people, that ʿAlī was infallible in all affairs and error free.[458]

This differs with the Ashʿarī creed which states:

In discussing the differences regarding Imāmate, a number of questions are posed regarding its essential structure. The question of designation which al-Ashʿarī states leads to two differing opinions. One opinion, the opinion of the Shīʿa, is that it is a divine designation, thereby continuing with one Imām inheriting the other. However, his opinion is that the people who 'loose and bind' may appoint the Imām. What is the number of people who 'loose and bind'?[459] This varies from one person from the community to an opinion that the whole community come together and elect.[460] Is an Imām a necessity? One school, namely the Shīʿa, believed that the world cannot exist without an Imām, whereas al-Ashʿarī denies this by stating that the people can be their own guides without the need of an Imām until

[457] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, 2.
[458] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, 16-17.
[459] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, 148.
[460] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, 149.

one is elected by them.[461]

The Imām can only be from Quraysh but al-Ashʿarī rejects the Twelver Shīʿa who state that he must be from the Banū Hāshim by stating that he could be from any of the Quraysh sub-groups.[462] The Imām must be the most excellent of the community, thus rejecting the opinion of the Zaydīs and most of the Muʿtazila.[463]

In his *Kitāb al-Luma'*, al-Ashʿarī continues to discuss the legitimacy of the Imāmate of Abū Bakr. In his answer to the question of the proof of Abū Bakr's Imāmate, he states:

> The proof of that is that we find men divided into three classes; 1) those who hold the Imāmate of ʿAlī after the apostle 2) those who hold the Imāmate of al-Abbās 3) those who hold the Imāmate of Abū Bakr. Now we see that ʿAlī and al-Abbās swore allegiance to Abū Bakr and submitted to his command in company with all the Muslims. Even though some put off swearing allegiance for a time, they finally agreed to swear allegiance to him, and to be guided by his leadership, and to rally under his banner, and to obey his orders. Moreover, they addressed him with the words 'O Caliph of the Apostle of God' and it is impossible for the community to agree on an error.[464]

Furthermore, he dismisses the belief that they may have been dissimulating their faith, 'For if that were possible, we should be unable to conclude the soundness of any consensus of the community on anything'.[465] Moreover, al-Ashʿarī uses the Qurʾān to define Abū Bakr's leadership with a verse which implicitly

---

[461] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, 149-50.
[462] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, 152.
[463] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, 151.
[464] Al-Ashʿarī, *Kitāb al-Luma'*, 112-113.
[465] Al-Ashʿarī, *Kitāb al-Luma'*, 113.

praises him. His leadership and bravery is further examined, with testimony given to his prowess in fighting the Persians, Byzantines and Yemenite.

> Men have maintained two opinions. Some said that the people of great valour were the Persians and the Byzantines; and others said that they were the Yamanites. Now Abū Bakr fought the Byzantines and the Yamanites; and the Persians were fought during his lifetime, and were conquered after his death. Hence if the people of great valor were the Yamanites or the Byzantines, Abū Bakr fought them - which necessitates his Imāmate. And if they were the Persians, they were fought in his lifetime and were later finished off by ʿUmar - which necessitates the Imāmate of ʿUmar.[466]

Furthermore, he denies that Abū Bakr was explicitly designated by the Prophet for this is:

> refuted by the fact that on the Day of the Porch, Abū Bakr said to ʿUmar, 'stretch forth thy hand that I may swear allegaince to thee'. For if the apostle of God had designated Abū Bakr's Imāmate, the latter could not have said, 'Stretch forth thy hand that I may swear allegiance to thee'.[467]

> We assert the Imām succeeding the apostle of God was Abū Bakr….The Muslims made him their Imām, just as Muḥammad had made him Imām at prayers. Then followed as legal Imām ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb; then ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān; his murderers killed him out of wickedness and enmity; then ʿAlī b. Abū Ṭālib. These are the Imāms after the Apostle, and their caliphate is that of the Prophetic office…We hold that the four Imāms were in the true way, were rightly guided and excellent, so that no on equals them

[466] Al-Ashʿarī, *Kitāb al-Luma'*, 115.
[467] Al-Ashʿarī, *Kitāb al-Luma'*, 116.

> in excellence…We uphold the prayer for peace for the Imāms of the Muslims, submission to their office, and maintain the error of those who hold it right to rise against them whenever they may be apparent in them a falling away from right. We are against armed rebellion against them and civil war.[468]

Abū Yaʿqūb al-Sijistānī

Numerous verses are provided as to the necessity of having and knowing the Imām, a classical Ismāʿīlī positon. Amongst these, he narrates chapter 17:71 of the Qurʾān, that 'on that Day, we will raise everybody with their Imām'. For every people there will be an Imām. This Imām acts as a guide to the people. The earth cannot exist without him, in either his manifest or hidden status,[469] confirming the concept of a belief in an Imām in occultation. He rejects those who maintain that God left his people without an Imām and without a guide or that the Imāmate can be taken by any of the common folk. The Imāmate is a necessity and is an appointment from God of the chosen ones of his creation.

> The proofs of God on earth, those endowed with knowledge, bestowed with wisdom whom through their light the souls are transformed in the midst of an environment of ignorance.[470]

Al-Sijistānī examines how the community of Muslims acted without an Imām in explaining his rationale behind the necessity of an Imām. God sent Messengers to the people but it is not conceivable that he would not appoint protectors of the message once the final messenger died. Without an Imām, 'bloodshed was

[468] D. B. Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology: Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), 297-8.
[469] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār*, 167.
[470] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 168.

caused, the honourable were mistreated and the community accused one another of disbelief'.[471]

The community would not have survived were it not for the presence of the chosen Imāms. They act as the pivot for the community, the direction and the point of return.

He explains that God sent the Prophet as a mercy to mankind, as a guide and a teacher. His role was not only to instruct creation but to gather them under one banner. He built principles for them to adhere to through his principle.

> Would God send this Prophet and then not appoint one to protect this legacy, these teachings and be an exemplar on how to adhere to these principles? This would be negligence on the part of God, and God is too High and Glorious to be associated with such accusations. The Imāms are a necessity to for the guidance of creation and the protection of the religion. What is clear is that the Prophet Muḥammad came to reveal and ʿAlī's role as successor was to protect the interpretation of what was revealed.[472]

The Imām being a necessity would mean that fighting him is to fight the word of God. Hence, he states that 'the first of your Imāms after the three who oppressed the successor was Muʿāwiya who the Prophet had already cursed'.[473] This statement reveals a clear rejection of the authority not only of the Umayyad but also of the basis of the appointment of the first three caliphs, which was viewed as an act of usurping the right of the Imām and the community as a whole.

---

[471] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 168.
[472] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 169.
[473] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 170.

Al-Sijistānī examines the jurisprudence behind the writing of a will. He quotes verse 2:180 from the Qurʾān:

> It is prescribed, when death approaches any of you, if he leave any goods that he make a bequest to parents and next of kin, according to reasonable usage; this is due from the God-fearing.[474]

So would the Prophet neglect such a duty and not appoint an executor? It is as if the religion he left behind for his community is not important enough to be protected in a will or that God has somehow excused his Prophet from acting upon this verse and it being binding upon him.[475] Is not the religion the source of all good and therefore priority would be given for its protection?

Al-Sijistānī examines the need for desgnation (*naṣṣ*) by stating that, upon the advent of Islam, there were two different groups in Arabia who seemingly submitted to the message. One group submitted with obedience and humility looking for the pleasure of God. The second group submitted only out of fear of the sword or to gain from the pleasure of this world. This group of hypocrites would surround the Prophet, sit with him, talk to him and travel with him where he migrated. They were not able to reveal their true intentions because of the fact that the Prophet would constantly be receiving revelations[476] from his Lord. God ordered the Prophet to announce the man who was 'the best of them in piety, honour, respect and knowledge'[477] and to

---

[474] *The Qur'ān.*
[475] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 151-2.
[476] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,*152.
[477] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 152.

reveal to him and teach him what he has been taught to be able to protect God's message on earth in order that these hypocrites would not be able to dismantle the religion from within after the Prophet had died. Therefore, designation, on a primary level, was to keep in check those within the religion and their conspiring to usurp.

The second important factor stated by al-Sijistānī as to why designation was incumbent on the Prophet was because of the political ties and diplomatic agreements that the Prophet had made with the different tribes. These tribes, both Arab and non-Arab, were of different characteristics and had different principles, but he was able to meet their every need and movement. He had to designate a figure who had the knowledge, the honour and the respect, as well as guidance from the heavens,[478] to ensure that these groups could be balanced and kept in check. The third factor relates to the protection of what was a relatively young message. Al-Sijistānī states that if the Prophet did not designate a succesor who could protect the message and whom he taught the secrets of Prophethood and the finer parts of wisdom, then people would imagine that the revelation was a hurried and forced message that ended abruptly and was not one which was aided by the heavens.[479]

Al-Sijistānī explains who was designated by making it clear that the lineage of the Prophet is a pure lineage through ʿAbd al-Muṭallib and that his successor would be from this line. The one from this line has to be the foremost in faith and that was ʿAlī, son of Abū Ṭālib. The first evidence chosen to prove this is a narration from the Prophet which states that:

[478] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 153.
[479] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 154.

> God looked upon his creation and chose the Arabs, he chose Quraysh from the Arabs, he chose ʿAbd al-Muṭallib from the Quraysh and chose me from the progeny of ʿAbd al-Muṭallib.[480]

To al-Sijistānī, the specific mention of ʿAbd al-Muṭallib highlights a direct link of the message through his lineage. ʿAlī was infallible in the sense that he never worshipped or prostrated before an idol, and was the fulfillment of the supplication of Abraham that his progeny are made Imāms and that they do not prostrate before an idol.[481] ʿAlī is described as the mosque built on piety - in contrast to the mosque built on hypocrisy by those who usurped his rights and who ended up disuniting the community of the Prophet.[482]

None have been given the merits that ʿAlī had been given according to al-Sijistānī. He was a believer. He was sincere unlike 'your Imāms who are the fountainheads of disbelief, the helpers of the satans, they await the idols and spread the casting of lots'.[483]

ʿAlī's knowledge cannot be equalled, this was his special privilege amongst the Companions. Al-Sijistānī quotes 13:43, stating that he was given the knowledge of the book, a special knowledge inspired by God. He is 'the City of Knowledge and the Ocean of Wisdom'.[484]

The man who is designated as an Imām must have a deep far-sighted vision and levels of knowledge to the highest degree. He

[480] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 155.
[481] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,*156.
[482] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 156.
[483] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 159.
[484] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 159.

must be the bravest of warriors who can lead. ‘Have you ever seen like or heard like ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib in the area of Bravery’?[485]

This highlights the importance of *shujāʿa* in early discourses concerning Islamic leadership, where ʿAlī’s bravery is contrasted with that of Muʿāwiya. Yet to al-Sijistānī, this bravery is not just displayed on the battlefield, but also in the patience that he observed while being oppressed and watching his right usurped. The world did not and could not deceieve ʿAlī in contrast to those who surrounded him. Who was as pure, physically and spiritually, as ʿAlī and who left offspring that equalled his?

ʿAlī was the man who the Qurʾān had clearly designated. According to al-Sijistānī, Kawther (abundance) was his progeny which was given as a gift to the Prophet through his wife Fāṭima. The others could not claim this merit. ʿAlī was designated as the Guardian of God’s message when a verse was revealed regarding the way he gave away what he had to a poor man while in his prayer in Medīna.[486] These evidences and his qualification as well as the pitfalls which the first three made opened for the community were to him the clearest proof that only ʿAlī and his lineage could lead the community to prosperity after the Prophet.

Shaykh al-Mufīd

Shaykh al-Mufīd explains that:

[485] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 160.
[486] Qur’ān 5:55.

> the Im□m□ya are those who hold the necessity of the Im□mate, *□i□ma* (infallibility), and the necessity of personal designation (*na□□*).[487]

The Im□mate is viewed as a necessity and is defined as those who:

> believe in the necessity (*wujub*) of the Im□mate and its presence in every time; who assert the necessity of explicit designation of the Im□ms (*na□□*), the infallibility *(□i□ma*) and perfection (*kamal*) of each Im□m; who believe that the Im□mate belongs exclusively to the descendants of al-□usayn b. □Al□, peace be upon them, and trace it down to □Al□ b. M□s□ al-Ri□a, peace be upon him.[488]

The necessity is rationally defined as that which keeps Muslims in obedience and keeps them away from disobedience. The Im□m acts as a chief and guide for the people, as well as standing against the oppressor when he oppresses and the unjust when they perform injustice. He leads them to the correct religious principles and helps restrain them from any type of corruption which would otherwise be viewed as destroying the order of the world:

> The Im□m□yya agree that there must be an Im□m existing in every age as God's argument for men who are under moral obligation. By his existence he is of consumate religious benefit. The Mu'tazila disagree with this. They allow the possibility of many ages being devoid of an existing Im□m. Joining them against the Im□mites in this opinion are the Khaw□rij, Zaydiyya, Murji'a and the people

---

[487] Ab□ Abdull□h Mu□ammad b. Mu□ammad al-Muf□d, *al-Fu□□l al-mukht□rah min al-□uy□n wa-al-ma□□sin* (Tehran: Intish□r□t-i Nav□d, 1983), 239-40.
[488] Ab□ Abdull□h Mu□ammad b. Mu□ammad al-Muf□d, *Aw□□il al-maq□l□t fi'l-madh□hib al-mukht□r□t*, ed. □Abb□sq□l□ S. Wajd□, with notes and introduction by Faẓl All□h Zanj□n□, 2nd edition (Tabriz: Charandabi, 1371), 42-3.

called traditionists.[489]

This necessity is justified by al-Mufīd in four different ways.[490] The first is through the Qurʾān. Two verses are quoted where the concept of authority in this world and the hereafter are discussed:

> O ye who believe! Obey Allah, and obey the Messenger, and those charged with authority among you..[491]

So he is implicitly enjoining knowledge of the Imāms by the fact that he enjoins obedience to them, just as He enjoins knowledge of Himself and of His Prophet by enjoining obedience to them both, as we have mentioned.

> And there is God's saying, 'On the day when we shall summon all the people to their Imām. And whoever is given his book in his right hand, such will read their book, and they shall not be wronged a shred'.[492] And no one can be summoned before a person without having first been obliged to know the person's identity.[493]

Al-Mufīd continues to discuss Imāmate and its necessity through tradition:

> As for tradition, a number of narrators report that the Prophet said: 'Whoever dies without having known the Imām of his age dies the death of one in the time of ignorance'. This clearly shows

[489] Al-Mufīd, *Awāʾil al-maqālāt*, 8.
[490] Abū Abdullāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Mufīd, *al-Ifṣāḥ fi Imāmat Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭalib*, 2nd edition (Najaf: al-Haidariyya, 1950), 3.
[491] Qurʾān 4:59.
[492] Qurʾān 17:71.
[493] Al-Mufīd, *al-Ifṣāḥ* , 3-4.

> that ignorance of the Imām excludes one from Islam.[494]

The third way is through consensus, binding upon all Muslims, even those he differs in opinion with where he states that:

> As for consensus, there is no dispute among the people of Islam that knowing the Imāms of the Muslims is as incumbent on the masses as most of their duties in religion.[495]

Furthermore, in discussing the roots of jurisprudence, consensus that does not include the Imāms is rejected; an Imām's authority can bring certainty to the whole community on a legal issue.

> I say that the consensus of the community is a valid argument because it includes the saying of the *Ḥujjah*, i.e., the Imām. And so to the consensus of the Shia without the consensus of all Muslims is a valid argument for the same reason. The basic principle here is the establishment of the truth by the word of the Imām who holds the place of the Prophet. And even if he alone were to say something with which no other man agreed, that would be sufficient argument and proof. In fact the only reason why we have mentioned consensus as an argument is the impossibility of having it without including him, for he has the greatest weight in the community and is superior to all in good deeds and rightness of word and act. This is the doctrine of the partisans of the Imāms exclusively. Opposed to it are the Mu'tazila, the Murji'a, the Khārijites and both the Qadarite and determinist traditionists.[496]

The fourth way is through reason and experience, shared as a principle seen as fundamental with Mu'tazilite thought:

---

[494] Al-Mufid, *al-Ifṣāḥ* , 4.
[495] Al-Mufīd, *al-Ifṣāḥ* , 4.
[496] Al-Mufīd*, Awāʾil al-maqālāt*, 99-100.

> As for reason and experience, we find that creatures are legally dependent on the Imāms. And this dependence requires that people have definite knowledge of them. Otherwise, in all duties which have been laid upon men, namely to submissively accept truths from them, to appeal to them for learning what they know, to refer to them the arbitration of their disputes, to have recourse to them in case of necessity, besides the need of their presence for establishing such obligations as prayers, almsgiving, pilgrimage, and holy war - in all these God would be morally obliging them to what they cannot fulfill. And since that is impossible for the Wise and Merciful One, it is certain that He has laid upon us the obligation to know the Imāms and has established their identity beyond all doubt.[497]

Al-Murtaḍā looks at the necessity of Prophethood before discussing the rational necessity of Imāmate. Moral obligations are recognised by man, but discerning what will help and what will hinder requires guidance. God, according to al-Murtaḍā, is obliged to send a Prophet to provide this guidance.[498] It is a form of grace from God to his creation. Al-Mufīd views revelation as the basis of this vision.[499] The rational argument is then postulated by al-Murtaḍā for the necessity of Imāmate when he states that:

> The way to prove its necessity is reason, contrary to the doctrine of the Mu'tazilites and their like. It is necessary only for bringing those who are under moral obligation close to what is for their interests and for keeping them far from what is

[497] Al-Mufīd, *al-Ifṣāḥ*, 4.
[498] Al-Sharīf Abū l-Qāsim ʿAlī b. al-Husain al-Murtaḍā aka Dhū l-Majdain aka ʿAlam al-Hudā, "*Majmu'a fi funūn min ʿilm al-kalām*" in *Nafā'is al-makhṭūṭāt,* ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl-Yāsīn, 1st edition (Baghdād: al-Ma'arif, 1955), vol. 5, 61-90.
[499] Al-Mufīd, *Awāʾil al-maqālāt*, 11.

harmful.[500]

Al-Mufīd differed with the Mu'tazilites regarding the issue of authority and leadership, considering that the early Mu'tazilites were Sunnī in thought. The Imāms are seen as the heir of the Prophet in every area where the Prophet was given authority. This includes the social, political, legal and economic affairs of the community:

> The Imāms take the place of the prophets in enforcing judgements, seeing to the execution of the legal penalties, safeguarding the law and educating mankind.[501]
> (ʿAbd al-Jabbār, 122)

Discussions concerning knowledge are prevalent within Shīʿī *kalām* works and reflect the discussions concerning ingredients for leadership in this period. The Imām is viewed as being the best of the people as well as the most knowledgeable. Knowledge is a rational necessity if he is seen as being the protector of Gods' law and the message of the Prophet. The word 'Imām' and 'ʿĀlīm' are used interchangeably.[502] The sources of the Imāms knowledge are God-given and denied to the community; namely 'transmission from the previous Imām, knowledge acquired in hereditary fashion, knowledge acquired from books whose contents are only known to the Imāms, and knowledge acquired through direct contact with an angel'.[503] *Ilhām* is the word used to describe this last method, the Imām hears a voice or gains knowledge in a dream.

---

[500] ʿAlam al-Hudā, "*al-Uṣūl al-itiqādiyya''* in *Nafā'is al-makhṭūṭāt,* ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl-Yāsīn, 1st edition (Baghdād: al-Ma'ārif, 1955), vol. 2, 79-92.
[501] Al-Mufīd, *Awāʾil al-maqālāt*.
[502] Kohlberg, *Imām and Community*, 25.
[503] Kohlberg, *Imām and Community,* 26.

The question arises as to whether this knowledge is confined to law or if it includes a mystical essence, an ability to witness the unseen. Al-Mufīd rejects the rational necessity of an Imām being required to know the unseen, replying to *ghulūw* arguments in this period. If God decides to give knowledge of the unseen to the Imāms, then he can and he will:

> I say that the Imāms of Muḥammad's family knew the consciences of some men and knew what would happen before it occurred. But that is not a necessary attribute of theirs, nor is it a requirement for their being Imāms. Rather it was only because God honoured them and gave them that knowledge as a help to the people for obeying them and adhering to their Imāmate. We know that they must have had that not by rational necessity, but because of revelation. As for asserting of them absolutely that they knew the unseen, that is an obvious error. No one deserves that qualification except Him who knows things by Himself, not by a knowledge bestowed upon Him. That is God alone. All Imāmites agree with this thesis of mine except a few partisans of delegation and those of the exaggerators who are related to them.[504]

The Imāms do not have this knowledge independently, rather it is dependent on what God decides to bestow upon them. However, this knowledge of an Imām is vital when issuing verdicts on legal issues and cases. They may receive inside knowledge or may be seen to differ with a witness' testimony.[505] Al-Mufīd states:

> I say that the Imām may judge according to his own knowledge , just as he judges by what appears from testimony. And when he

[504] Al-Mufīd, *Awāʾil al-maqālāt*, 38.
[505] McDermott, *The Theology of Shaykh al-Mufīd,* 108.

> knows firsthand the contrary of what the testimony says, he thereby cancels out the witness' testimony and judges by what God has made known to him. It is also possible, in my opinion, that the inner aspects of things may escape him, and so he would judge by appearances, even though they be contrary to the truth as God sees it. And it is possible too that God may show him the difference between the truthful and the lying witnesses, so that the true state of affairs would not be hidden from him. The matters in this chapter have to do with favours and best interests, which only God knows fully. The Im□mites have three positions on this subject; some hold that the Im□ms judgements are based on appearances, not what they know, in every case, others hold that their judgements are based exclusively on the inner aspect, not on appearances, which can contradict them, others hold the doctrine I have chosen.[506]

This is viewed as a moderate position.[507] Did Im□ms □Al□ and □usayn 'walk to their deaths'? Al-Muf□d believes that the Sh□□□ are not in agreement that their Im□ms can foresee future events and know exactly what will happen. The legal status of everything is what they know for certain.[508] Al-Murta□□ goes further by stating that before assuming the position, the Im□m is not aware of all legal precepts.[509] Furthermore, they question a sort of omniscience of the Im□m, stating that he has to consult experts on *non-shari'* issues and issues such as commercial deals and transactions.[510] The caliph therefore must be able to direct the community in all their affairs, ritual and commercial and not be seen simply as a political leader. Mu□□wiya may be viewed as being a man of knowledge in terms of

[506] Al-Muf□d, *Aw□□il al-maq□l□t*, 36-7.
[507] Al-Ash□□r□, *Maq□l□t al-isl□miyy□n*, 50.
[508] Al-Muf□d, a*l-Mas□'il al-ukbarriyya*, cited in McDermott, *The Theology of Shaykh al-Muf□d*, 109.
[509] Al-Shar□f Ab□ l-Q□sim □Al□ b. al-Husain al-Murta□□ aka Dh□l-Majdain aka □Alam al-Hud□, *al-Sh□f□ fil Im□ma* (Tehran, 1301/1884), 76-78.
[510] Al-Murta□□, *al-Sh□f□*, 188-9.

military command but not necessarily as one whose knowledge is divinely inspired to guide the community in all their affairs.

Al-Bāqillānī

Al-Bāqillānī introduces the examination of the designation of an Imām through a discussion of the different narrations at the disposal of the Muslims. There is a recognition that at the beginning of the revelation of the religion, the Muslims were united in their thoughts and principles under a guide who was receiving revelations from God. However, the Prophetic statement that there would be disunity after he passes away and that the religion would be split into 73 sects would lead to an inevitable split.[511]

This split would lead to differing views which would affect the reliability of a narration. There may be some narrations with a single narrator. However, the more trustworthy narrations would not only have more narrators, but would also have a concurrence on content and context.[512] Thus when the issue of Imāmate is examined, the narrations show concurrence on the caliphs being chosen by the people rather than designated by God as the Shīʿa would believe. This would therefore lead to a conclusion that *naṣṣ* is to be rejected.[513] Al-Bāqillānī refutes the Shīʿa by stating that there does not seem to be any reliable narrations discussing such a designation. Moreover, such a designation would have been easier to understand if it was in reference to an Imāmate of the Anṣār. Furthermore, such a designation would imply that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar have acted unjustly in usurping

[511] Al-Bāqillānī, *Manāqib*, 29.
[512] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Tamhīd*, 164.
[513] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Tamhīd,* 164.

the caliphate, which is something viewed as inconceivable.[514]

In refuting the Sh□□□ doctrine of designation, al-B□qill□n□ states that the Im□m is to be established in his office either through testamentary designation or through an election between those who 'loose and bind', known in the Arabic language as *ahl al-ḥall wal-□aqd.*[515] In defence of the Saq□fah election of Ab□ Bakr and in refutation of the Sh□□a, al-B□qill□n□ states that a single member of those who 'loose and bind' can undertake the election on behalf of a person who is deemed fit to be the Im□m, but a group of Muslims must witness the pledge of allegiance and then make this known to the general public. The community elect the caliph but cannot break this contract unless in a case which would inevitably lead to the post being vacated. The community should choose someone is who is the most excellent, '*al- af□al*', from among them, however, if this would cause dissension, than they could choose the less excellent, '*al-maf□ul'*,[516] in a similar line to Zayd□ thought. If there was an Im□m who was the most excellent from among the people and who became known at a later time, while a less excellent Im□m was in office, this would not be grounds for the forfeiture of his position.[517]

Al-B□qill□n□ discusses the qualities of an Im□m stating that he must be a true Quraysh□, must posses knowledge, since he must judge righteously amongst the community and must therefore be able to differentiate between what is lawful and unlawful, he must also possess sound judgement in warfare and management of the armies of the state as his role is to protect the community from outside forces and finally he must possess courage in war

[514] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 168.
[515] Al-B□qill□n□, *Man□qib*, 33.
[516] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 193.
[517] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 180.

and valour. Hence, *ʿilm* and *shujāʿa* once again emerge as being vital ingredients in the issue of leadership.[518]

There can only be one Imām leading the community. Al-Bāqillānī therefore rejected the legality of two or more Imāms at the same time, reflecting the political situation of the number of caliphates in his period which spread across the Islamic empire. There can be two types of differences which emerge in the Muslim community in relation to rival groups claiming different Imāms. The first would be differences regarding *shari'ah* and legal thought. To al-Bāqillānī, such differences could be resolved by giving priority to the Imām who assumed office first. He is to be obeyed and disobedience was tantamount to rebellion. If the issues were such that there would be accusations of disbelief and infidels, then the Imāmate belonged to what was vaguely known as *ahl al-ḥaqq* or the people of truth.

> There are proofs that our associates, not the Muʿtazila or the Najjarīyya or any other sects who claim to belong to the Umma are that sect, the true sect. If we are able, we must compel the others to obey the one to whom we contract the Imāmate. If they overrule us and contract the Imāmate to one who agrees with them, his Imāmate is not valid and no obedience is due to him. In such a case we would be in the abode of force and constraint (*dār qahr wa ghalaba*). And if the sects are disputing and at odds with each other that would constitute civil war, which would be a reason for not contracting the Immate (*al-ʻuthr bihā fī tark al-ʿaqd*). If the followers of the true religion (*ahl al-ḥaqq*) formed a military grouping and went to war and contracted the Imāmate to one of themselves, he would be the Imām and not anyone from among those who were errant (*ahl al-ḍalāl*).[519]

[518] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Tamhīd*, 183.
[519] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Tamhīd*, 181.

The Im□m must be from the Quraysh, thereby refuting the Sh□□a who confined the Im□mate to the house of □Al□ and the Kh□rij□s who believed that any Muslim who was upright and dutiful could become an Im□m. Furthermore, knowledge was a key criteria for the post. The Im□m would not only act as a guide to the nation in their spiritual affairs, but would have to have knowledge of good and bad, right and wrong in order to act as a guide to the *Q□□□s* he appointed. There is not, however, in contrast to the Sh□□□s, a need for him to have secret knowledge or have the most outstanding character of those who surround him.[520] The Im□m is the *wak□l* (protector) of the community. His simple task was to enforce the *shari'ah* which had preceded him. Therefore, infallibility, as set forth within the Sh□□a school of thought, was not a pre-requisite. He did not have to be infallible, in the same way that those delegated with authority surrounding him did not have to. When he errs, the community corrects him.

Al-B□qill□n□ discusses the functions of an Im□m. The first is to defend the Muslim community from opposition and outside forces. The second is to remove oppression and address the grievances of the citizens of the state. Third, he is to implement the punishments from *shari'ah*. Fourth, division of the spoils of war from the conquests which had been undertaken. Fifth, to allow the members of the state to travel on the pilgrimage and make it safe for them. The Im□m is not infallible from committing acts of transgression and it is the duty of the community to be ready to correct him when he errs and to guide him aright.[521]

However, al-B□qill□n□ did not hold the opinion that Im□mate was a necessity and this was a point of difference with later

[520] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 181-2.
[521] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 185-6.

Ash□□r□ thought. Ab□ Man□□r □Abd al-Q□hir T□hir al-Baghd□d□, who was an Ash□□r□ scholar spending most of his time in N□shap□r, compiled the work *Us□l al-d□n*. This work, in line with the *Tam□□d*, refuted the Sh□□a, Kh□rij□s and Mu□tazila. Im□mate is discussed under nine headings, including the questions of necessity, designation, the number of Im□ms and the impeccability of the Im□m. He differs with al-B□qill□n□ when discussing necessity.

> There is disagreement as to the necessity of the Im□mate and the necessity of seeking out and setting up an Im□m. The general body of the Sunn□s, both theologians and canonists (*jumh□r ashab□na min al-mutakillim□n wa'l fuqah□'*) together with the Sh□□a, the Khaw□rij and most of the Mu□tazila, hold the Im□mate to be compulsory, that to set up an Im□m and to submit to him are necessary, and that it is essential for the Muslims to have an Im□m to execute their ordinances, enforce legal penalties, direct their armies, marry their widows, and divide the revenues amongst them. They are opposed only by a handful of the Qadar□yya, such as Ab□ Bakr al-Aṣamm, who asserted that if people were to refrain from mutual injury they would have no need of an Im□m, and Hish□m al-Fuwaṭ□, who held that an Im□m was necessary when the community was united in the way of right, but not at the time of civil war. Those who hold the Im□mate to be a compulsory obligation disagree as to the reason for its necessity. Those of the Mu□tazila who maintain the doctrine of divine bounty assert it to be compulsory only because it is a divine bounty for the maintenance of the revealed laws. Al-Ash□□r□ argued that the Im□mate is itself an ordinance of the revealed law, and that though it can be demonstrated by reason that subordination to it is admissible, the necessity of it is known only by the authority of the revelation. Furthermore, the companions of the Prophet were unanimous on its necessity, and in view of their unanimity no

regard is to be paid to the opposition of isolated individuals.[522]

How the Imām is to be designated is then discussed by al-Baghdādī:

> There is disagreement also on the method whereby the Imāmate is established, whether it is by designation or by election. The vast generality of our associates and of the Muʿtazila, the Khārijī and the Najjārīya hold that the method of its establishment is by election on the part of the community, through the exercise of reasonable judgment (*ijtihād*) by those of them who are qualified to do so and their selection of one who is fitted for the office. Its establishment by designation would have been permissible, but in fact no designation of any individual is known to have been made in regard to it, and therefore the community had recourse to selection for it…Since, then, the establishment of the Imāmate by the method of selection is accepted by us as valid, there is a further disagreement among the partisans of elections as to the number of actual electors of the Imām. Al-Ashʿarī held that the Imāmate is validly contracted on behalf of one who is fitted for it by the contract of a single pious man who is qualified to exercise *ijtihād*, when he does so in favour of one who is fitted for it and when he does so, then it is incumbent on the remainder to render him obedience. If, however, the contract is made by one who exercises *ijtihād* but is an evildoer, or by a learned person in favour of one who is unfitted for it, such an Imāmate is not validly contracted.[523]

Al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān[524]

[522] Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī, *Uṣūl al-dīn* (Istānbūl: Madrasat al-Ilāhīyāt bi-Dār al-Funūn al-Turkīyah, 1928), vol. 1, 270-1, simplified translation in H.A.R. Gibb, “Constitutional Organisation” in *Law in the Middle East*, ed. Majid Khadduri and Herbert J. Liebesny (Washington D.C., 1955), 7.
[523] Al-Baghdādī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, vol. 1, 177-9.
[524] al-Qāḍī Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān b. Abū ʿAbdillāh Muḥammad b. Manṣūr at-Tamīmī

Al-Nu□m□n believed in the necessity of an Im□m to act as a guide to mankind. He is the axis of the community, the reference point for the people and their exemplar. Without an Im□m, none can understand what is meant by faith and certainty. Not knowing the Im□m of one's time is a reflection of a return to the days of ignorance in pre-Islamic Arabia:

> All the Muslims agree unanimously about the necessity of an Im□m who would unite them together, protect them from the enemies, execute the commands of God, administer justice, set the punishments in accordance with the prohibitions of God, wage holy war, maintain peace in the land and uproot all heresies and corruption. If they destroy his authority the distinct marks of the faith would be impaired, and a mishap may befall Islam. It would further mean going back to the pre-Islam days of ignorance and forsaking the *shar□'ah*.[525]

Al-Nu□m□n discusses verse 4:59, which was refuted by al-J□□i□, as evidence of the Im□mate of the Im□ms and the necessary obedience binding upon the community. Had the Muslims obeyed these leaders, there would be no discord amongst them, but only a few followed the rightful guides:

> It was this latter state of affairs which was disdained by the Almighty and He granted Islam rightful wielders of power in every age who would always execute All□h's commands. This is referred to in the Koran when it says: 'O believers, obey God, and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you'.[526] Would that the Muslims had obeyed those rightful wielders of power, they would have been prosperous! But, they disobeyed them and followed the

(d. 363/974).
[525] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 26.
[526] Qur□□n 4:59

> usurpers. Thus they reverted to error. Only a small band of devoted Muslims associated themselves with the rightful Im□ms and followed them.[527]

Al-Nu□m□n, however, finds it hard to reconcile how the Murji'ites believe in the necessity of an Im□m but do not believe that the Prophet appointed or designated one. If Im□mate was a necessity, then the man who came to act as a guide to his people was negligent of their future and is the cause of their feuds and discords.

> The arguments against the Murji'ites about their denial of anyone being appointed by the Prophet as his succesor would be the same as against those who deny the will of the Prophet. When they maintain such a position, viz., the Prophet did not appoint anyone to succeed him, how can they claim that the Im□mate is a necessity? Do they know it better than their Lord and His Prophet? Did they and the people, who installed the caliph soon after the death of the Prophet, have more knowledge and a better insight into the affairs of the community than All□h and his messenger?[528]

The qualifications of an Im□m were a major point of difference and discord between the rival groups. Al-Nu□m□n recognises that necessity is accepted as well as H□shimite descent. But the question as to whether the best of men is their ruler or one who takes advice and knowledge from the best of his contempraries was a point of disagreement. Must he be infallible and knowledgeable or simply one with good traits and ready to take responsibility of the guidance of the community? He sides with the Sh□'a definition, discussing what qualifies an Im□m in their

[527] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 26.
[528] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 30.

school. Knowledge is viewed as paramount and bravery on the battlefield, differing with al-J□□i□:

> The Sh□'ites state that the Im□m, the upholder of the *shar□'ah*, should be like the Prophet, although the Prophet has no equal. He should be the first to have embraced Islam, the most learned, and the foremost in respect of piety, forbearance, and chastity.

Al-Nu□m□n attacks the Mu'tazila, the Kh□rijites and the Murji'ites. Their definition of what qualifies an Im□m for his position cannot be rationally or traditionally accepted. Accepting that the most learned of the community is amongst the qualifications which they have in common with his definition of an Im□m, he questions the scrutiny that is kept, by the Mu'tazila and the Kh□rijites, on this Im□m in relation to his administration of justice. If he rules with justice he is to be obeyed, if he rules unjustly he is to be disobeyed. The Murji'ites on the other hand, will not question his injustice. To al-Nu□m□n, an Im□m is to be obeyed at all times because justice is a pre-requisite in his appointment and designation; his infallibility leads to his constant justice with himself and the citizens of the state.

> How strange is the idea of deposing the Im□m who was installed by them. But, how could they depose him the Im□m while he is nothing but an agent set up by them? Their argument that they would obey him even if he is unjust, provided he fulfils partially what has been laid down by them, is fallacious. This lends them to impose the obedience of the unjust ruler upon themselves. Do they not read in the Qur□□n that God has warned people against supporting the unjust rulers? God says:[529] 'And lean not on the evil-doers so

[529] Qur□□n 11:113.

that the fire touches you'.[530]

Al-Nu□m□n diasagrees with the notion of the *f□□il* and the *maf□ul* in Mu'tazilite and Zayd□ thought. The *maf□ul*, translated as 'one who is made worthy'[531] can be the head of the community ahead of the *f□□il* translated as 'the most worthy or the superior'.[532] Rationally this theory is rejected. A man of less merit leads the Muslim community while there is a contemporary who has a higher rank and standing withing the community. This is the way al-Nu□m□n perceives the rationale of the Mu□tazila when Ab□ Bakr was chosen ahead of □Al□:

> By selecting the first three caliphs and giving them preference over □Al□ they not only encroached upon the right of the latter, but preferred the *maf□ul* to the *f□□il*. Hence, what is the criterion for preference? Is it not the excellence and the merit of the candidate? Certainly. They further agree that the excellence is indicated by the possession of certain qualities and various traits of character such as seniority in accepting Islam, knowledge of the Koran and *sunnah*, sacrifice in the military campaigns of the Prophet, piety, godliness…Now, the question is who has this quality or that? In their answers, they always cite the name of □Al□ along with the names of the various companions who were well-known for one particular trait or the other. □Al□ therefore tops the list which proves his excellence over all other Companions. How, then, is it permissible for sensible people to select the *maf□ul* over the *f□□il*?[533]

Al-Nu□m□n's discussion examines the philosophy, rationale and traditions behind the designation of an Im□m. The philosophy of

---

[530] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 29.
[531] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 33.
[532] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 33.
[533] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 53.

designation has a bearing on the way the Prophet is perceived and the tradition of God continues. From the outset, al-Nu□m□n stresses that every Prophet of God had announced a successor before leaving his people, in a chapter entitled the Will of the Prophet; the Prophets and the Appointment of their *Awsiy□*:

> It has been agreed upon unanimously by the people that when Adam was entrusted with the Prophethood he appointed his son Seth as his *waṣ□*. The latter succeeded his father to be in turn succeeded by Enos. Enos has Cainan for his successor, Cainan-Mahaleel, Mahaleel-Jared, Jared-Enoch, Enoch-Methuselah, Methuselah-Lamoch, Lamoch-Noah. When Noah received the revelation, he appointed Shem to be his *waṣ□*. Thenceforth, the masses were deprived of knowledge about the succession until the appeance of Abraham. According to some, Ishmael was the *waṣ□* and the successor of Abraham, while according to others Isaac was the *waṣ□* and the successor. It is also agreed that after the passing away of Aaron, Moses appointed Joshua the son of Nun to be his *waṣ□*, and Simon was the *waṣ□* of Jesus. But the people differed over the *waṣ□* and the successor of the Prophet Mu□ammad.[534]

The difference resulted in a number of groups that emerged which either believed that the Prophet designated a successor, or that he left the decision to the people. Al-Nu□m□n analyses whether the appointment of a successor is a *far□da* or a *sunnah*. If neither, then it falls under *bi'da*', an inconsistency which is the basis of those who believe the Prophet did not appoint a successor:

> Further pointing to the inconsistency in their arguments, he states that how can they claim the Im□mate to be a necessity

[534] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 20.

> while they maintain that the Prophet did not appoint anyone to succeed him. If it was a necessity and the Prophet did not designate anyone, he neglected the affairs of the community. Or if the Prophet did not nominate anyone thinking that it was neither a *farīda* nor a *sunnah*, then their proposition, viz., the Imāmate is a necessity, according to the *shari'ah* is a *bi'da'*, and all the innovations, as the tradition says, are errors. Hence, their proposition leads them to the charge of infidelity and tampering with the *shari'ah*.[535]

Al-Nuʿmān continues to discuss the subject of those who deny the designation by the prophet through examining legal procedure. If a witness categorically states an event took place, this cannot be invalidated by one who denies it. The Qurʾān instructs people to write a will. This will acts as an instruction for the future of his personal belongings. If the Prophet is to protect his personal belongings, how about the protection and the guidance of the people who follow him.

> On the other hand they realise the need of the community for an Imām when they say that Imāmate is a necessity. At the same time they maintain that the Prophet did not designate anyone as his successor, and that he bequeathed only his personal belongings to ʿAlī. This implies that the Prophet was more concerned about his personal belongings and his family than about his community. How dare they say such a thing. It further implies that he did not follow the course of his predecessors - the earlier Prophets - in appointing a successor. But this implied conclusion is falsified by the Koran as it states, 'There has come to you a Messenger from among yourselves, unto whom your distress is grievous, and who is full of concern for you and who is gentle and compassionate with the believers'.[536] It means that their premise

[535] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān*, 14.
[536] Qurʾān 9:128.

> is wrong.[537]

Any argument that states that the will designated authority for the community is also rejected. First, al-Nu□m□n views such an act as contradicting the acts of previous Prophets and their successors. Second, every member of the community could claim to be an Im□m which would then raise a question as to how one can justify choosing one Im□m over another:

> If the Prophets will was to the community at large, as they alleged, then every person would have to be an Im□m. It also implies that those who believed in the Im□mate of one over the other could be accused of infidelity, with the unacceptable conclusion that their predecessors too were guilty of it. Such a proposition is not only contrary to what has been agreed by the community, viz., the Im□mate is a necessity, but also to the Koran and the *Sunnah*. The Koran says:[538] 'O believers, obey God, and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you'.[539]

The Mu□tazilite concept of the people being given the task of choosing an Im□m is rejected. It is viewed as being 'fallacious as well as lacking the support of any trustworthy narrator'.[540]

It is, however, a trust which has been given to these people that al-Nu□m□n cannot comprehend. A group of people who only 23 years earlier had been Bedouins in the age of ignorance were now able to choose who would lead an empire. He states that:

> the people would have never agreed to the choice of one person, had it been left to them. This was the very cause of apostasy,

[537] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 24.
[538] Qur□□n 4:59.
[539] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 25.
[540] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n,* 31.

> injustice, polytheism and ruin soon after the death of the Prophet.[541]

'Arrogant' is the way al-Nu□m□n describes those who accept the method in which Ab□ Bakr was elected. The very definition of what constitutes an election is questioned. Are the electors all meant to be present? Are they all meant to vote? How about those not present, why were they not informed. Furthermore, to al-Nu□m□n, the rush to elect a leader highlighted his point that the Qur□□n and *sunnah* did not seem to have guided the companions, and that his argument of designation of □Al□ at Ghad□r is more rational and traditional. Ab□ Bakr's election is viewed with disdain and remorse:

> How was Ab□ Bakr raised to the caliphate? He was installed, indeed, by a clique the very day the Prophet died. While the latter's body was lying shrouded, and the members of his family were overtaken by grief and sorrow, that clique seized the opportunity and usurped the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt. When did they have any consultation, O you arrogant people? Did all the people present in Med□na besides those who were away attend the gathering? Surely not. They admit that neither □Al□ nor any H□shimite was present in that gathering. They also admit that neither Ab□ Dharr al-Ghif□r□, nor 'Amm□r b. al-Y□sir, nor Salm□n al-F□ris□, nor Hudhaifa b. al-Yaman, nor □Abdull□h b. al-Mas□□d, nor Zubair b. al-Aww□m, nor Miqd□d b. al-Aswad were present in that gathering of Saq□fah Ban□ Sa'idah. What kind of election was it?[542]

How could the Mu'tazilites accept that these prominent companions would not participate in the electing of the new

[541] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n,* 31.
[542] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 31-2.

caliph. Furthermore, would these companions not also be concerned that a caliph be installed, unless their lack of concern showed their knowledge that a caliph had been appointed. Al-Nu□m□n states that:

> the main contention of the Mu'tazilites is the community was entrusted with the choice of the Im□m to be elected by mutual consultation amongst themselves. From the above description it is evident that there was no consultation at all in the installation of the new caliph. Rather, he was imposed on the community.[543]

If the community was entrusted with appointing the caliph, then who gave Ab□ Bakr the right to appoint □Umar as his successor. Al-Nu□m□n states that this:

> implies that the Prophet's explicit precept of consultation, which they consider as the *far□da*, was dispensed with. An whoever tampers with the *far□da*, as agreed upon by the community, is charged with infidelity.[544]

Moreover, a group emerged which states that the Prophet did not designate a successor as an act of mercy for his people. Had he designated a successor, in their opinion, obedience to the successor would thus have been binding on all the Muslims. Had they disobeyed, then they would be classed as infidels, and this is not what the Prophet wanted for his community. To al-Nu□m□n, obedience to the succesor is obligatory on every citizen of the Islamic state. It is not an arbitary matter. If you disobey, this is your free will and you become the cause of your own infidelity. Furthermore, if it is viewed as an act of mercy by not designating a successor, then the Prophet creates a

[543] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 33.
[544] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 33.

community where there is concession for disobedience. This cannot be accepted, and therefore obedience to the designated Imām has to be binding on everyone. Furthermore, if it is an act of mercy, why was this mercy not displayed by Abū Bakr when he designated ʿUmar, or by ʿUmar in the *shūrā* of six to appoint ʿUthmān?

The merits of Abū Bakr include him being alongside the Prophet on the night of migration in the cave as well as being in the tent at Badr. Al-Nuʿmān sees no merit in one who the 'Prophet saw weeping and frightened'.[545] The Prophet would not rebuke this act if it was one of obedience and one of gaining proximity to God. Furthermore, to call Abū Bakr a companion is not of significance to al-Nuʿmān. He cites a verse from the Qurʾān where an unbeliever is termed as a companion.[546] As for Abū Bakr being in the tent of the Prophet at Badr, this is attacked by al-Nuʿmān:

> They also mention that Abū Bakr sat with the Prophet in the latter's tent during the battle of Badr - another indication. While a fierce battle ensued, he kept resting there in the shade. What a perversity to consider it a virtue. Did they not recite the Qurʾān when Allāh explicitly states,[547] 'Those of the believers who sit still, other than those who suffer injury, are not the equal of those who strive in the way of Allāh with their wealth and their lives. Allāh has given preference in rank to those who strive with their wealth and their lives over those who sit still'.[548] Other attributes, such as Abū Bakr sitting by the Prophet's right are rejected, 'If sitting on the Prophet's right side were to be a privilege then all those who sat on the right

[545] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān*, 38.
[546] Qurʾān 18:32-37.
[547] Qurʾān 4:95-6.
[548] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān*, 39.

> side would be as eligible for the caliphate as Abū Bakr. And if the names of all those privileged persons, in addition to the various delegates who paid visits to the Prophet during the year of delegation, are enumerated it would make a long list. How then could one possibly deprive them of their candidacy to the caliphate?[549]

Moreover, leading the final prayer was seen as the strongest indicator that Abū Bakr would lead the state after the Prophet. To al-Nuʿmān, the incident was a lie. Rationally speaking, this would allow a conclusion that anyone who led the prayer in the time of the Prophet was eligible to become caliph. For a school that believes that both the pious and the less pious can lead, this is somewhat contradictory:

> At the same time they maintain that it is perfectly legitimate to be led in prayer by any Imām, whether pious or libertine. Thus, according to them, if anyone could lead the prayer, where is the merit for Abū Bakr? How inconsistent and contradictory these arguments are.

ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ is then cited as a possible candidate based on this irrational method.[550] Al-Nuʿmān looks at the different ways the incident is narrated and to him this highlights contradictions. One version is discussed which narrates the Prophet asking Abū Bakr to lead, another states Abū Bakr was leading for a few days already, whereas in another ʿĀʾisha is rebuked for asking her father to lead.[551]

Al-Nuʿmān begins to recount the merits of ʿAlī above his

[549] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān*, 40.
[550] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān*, 41.
[551] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān*, 41.

contemporaries and how he was designated to lead from a young age. The issue of the youth of ʿAlī was important to al-Nuʿmān, for ʿAlī was belittled as not being able to comprehend what he had submitted to religiously.

> So they alleged that ʿAlī was an infant, it would seem that either the Prophet himself invited him to accept the new faith or else God inspired him to it. If he was inspired, he was honoured. If he was invited by the Prophet to accept Islam, he was considered worthy of it. In either case it was a merit for him.[552]

ʿAlī was the 'vizier and the *amīr*'[553] who had accepted the call of the Prophet when he was ordered to reveal the religion to his nearest kinsmen. The family of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib were invited for a feast in which Muḥammad announces his Prophethood. He states that whoever accepts his words will succeed him and his community.

Everyone refused except ʿAlī who came forward as the Prophet's helper. Thereafter they dispersed ridiculing both the Prophet and ʿAlī. This was the earliest explicit pronouncement of the Prophet that ʿAlī was to succeed him.[554] The fraternity between the Immigrants and the Helpers is discussed as the second explicit announcement concerning ʿAlī, with the Prophet stating, 'You are my brother, my sword and my shield. You are my *waṣī* and the Imām after my death'.[555]

ʿAlī was never placed under the command of any companion. He was always the commander and to al-Nuʿmān this was significant when

[552] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān* , 40.
[553] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān* , 54.
[554] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān* , 54.
[555] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān* , 55.

looking at the proofs of a designation taking place before the day of Ghad□r. Khaybar is discussed as an example of the way □Al□ valiantly brought victory to the Muslims, meeting the qualification of an Im□m being full of valour. Another qualification and attribute was his knowledge; al- Nu□m□n narrates how:

> the Prophet also said that □Al□ was the most learned man in judicial matters, and this is the pivotal issue for the caliphate since all state matters revolve around it.[556]

On the day of Ghad□r, □Al□ is described as being to Mu□ammad as Aaron was to Moses, and that he 'is your *wal□* after my death, and whose *mawl□* I am □Al□ is his *mawl□*'.[557] Did the word '*mawl□*' refer to Us□mah now being the freed slave of □Al□ after Mu□ammad? Was it in the context of the dispute with Kh□lid at Yemen? Or was it a Guardianship conferred upon the Muslims by the Qur□□n?[558] To al-Nu□m□n, the word *mawl□* had several meanings and this was not doubted. But the word *mawl□,* in this context, meant the first in authority as intended by Mu□ammad. 'These reasons are the most convincing indications and unequivocal statements in favour of □Al□ compared to what they claim for Ab□ Bakr'.[559]

The fact that Ab□ Bakr and □Umar viewed their leaderships as a *falta* (a slip)[560] was further proof that they were not fit to lead and succeed after Mu□ammad. A number of key decisions which they gave, including the denial of the land of Fadak from the

---

[556] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 56.
[557] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n* , 56.
[558] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 58-9.
[559] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 56.
[560] A hasty mistake or anything done without consideration, an affair that happened without it being soundly performed.

hands of F□□ima as well as her subsequent martyrdom due to their actions are discussed to further emphasize the tragedy of the whole affair.[561]

Conclusion

This chapter sought to examine the classical Islamic concepts of authority and leadership. In conclusion, the discourse based on the qualities and attributes of the leader of the Muslim community is the earliest discourse in Islamic society. There is a clear overlap, when examining the different genres of classical literature, in discussions concerning the necessity and conditions of the leader of the Islamic Polity. For example, when examining the Sh□□□ conception of authority and the criteria used it is vital to understand that in the 1st and 2nd century of Islam, Sh□□a ideas and beliefs had a profound impact on political and religious thought. Im□mism was seen to be an independent system of religious authority as well as an:

> historical interpretation that profoundly informs its views within the various religious disciplines and is perpetuated through its own highly structured intellectual and religious hierarchy.[562]

The Sh□□a were not to be dismissed as a 'heterodox sect', for this would be the conclusion of one who has misunderstood the development of early Islam and especially the debate concerning authority. Hodgson, points to this where he views Sunn□sm as 'at least half Sh□□ite', in relation to the Sh□□a reverence for the

[561] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 49.
[562] M. Dakake, *The Charismatic Community*, Introduction.

descendants of the Prophet.[563] In this early period, the Sh□□a would be characterized by their pledge of allegiance to the descendants of the Prophet. Furthermore, they would also be characterized by their stand against the Umayyad dynasty.[564]

The Im□m was viewed as the highest political authority after the Prophet. This was based on designation by the previous Im□m, a concept known as *na□□* (a known, or clear, legal injunction), and the possession of exclusive religious knowledge, known as *□ilm*. Using the inter-textual approach, we see that not only the Sh□□□ school but also the different schools of theology, as well as belles-lettres, through analysis of historical works, would develop arguments concerning the criteria for leadership and what constituted a righteous guide. The main attributes that emerge relate to *□ilm* and *shuj□□a*. This does not mean that other attributes such as kinship and generosity can be rejected. However, these attributes are clearly stipulated in the discourses of this period of Islamic thought and will be examined as themes to provide a historiographical depiction of the caliphate of Mu□□wiya b. Ab□ Sufy□n. In none of these works, both Sunn□ and Sh□□a, is there a discussion of the importance of the attribute of *□ilm* in the criteria for leadership, an attribute which seems to emerge with discussions concerning the leadership of Mu□□wiya. Importantly, Im□mate is reflected in the period of rule of the first four caliphs, with the exposition of authority in many works changing to an exposition of kingship after the death of □Al□.

[563] M. Hodgson, "How Did the Early Shi'a Become Sectarian?''
[564] Heinz Halm, *Sh□□ism* (Edinburgh, 1992), 14-24; V. Ivanow, "Early Sh□□ite Movements", *JBBRAS* (1941), 1-23; W. Montgomery Watt, "Sh□□ism under the Umayyads", *JRAS* (1960), 158-172.

Chapter 4

The Biography of Mu□□wiya As Depicted in Classical and Modern Literature

In studying Mu□□wiya's leadership, it is vital to understand his depiction in historical sources and how modern authors have presented him. The historical sources narrate his presence in the formative years of the Islamic community from a number of different angles. They would seek to present his lineage as well as the nobility of his relatives. Hence, it is vital to understand the complex lineage and tribal structures of ancient Arabia. In ancient Arabia, families and clans were not only complex entities, but their relations with each other were perceived as being more complex. If you were a member of a particular lineage you would claim descent from a common ancestor. These discussions concerning lineages would allow two people to know whether they were to view each other as being neutral, blood enemies or allies. Furthermore, key decisions are also narrated which would have a bearing on his depiction as caliph. Every appointment, removal and command would have a bearing on the way he is portrayed by modern authors. Modern authors would analyse these decisions, reconstruct them and seek to provide an understanding of their relation to the debates concerning leadership and authority in early Islam.

The Quraysh tribe dominated Mecca. Several small groups made up the Quraysh. These groups may have originally been smaller clans, who saw themselves as part of single lineage who claimed Fihr as a common ancestor. There was great variation in size and wealth of the Quraysh clans. □Abd Man□f was one of the major groupings and they were divided into two subsects, the H□shim and the □Abd Shams. The Prophet was born into the H□shim, which had branches that used to guard the Ka□bah and provide water for pilgrims. The □Abd Shams, however, were viewed as being different, both in wealth and power. Ab□ Sufy□n and his wife

Hind both belonged to prestigious families within the ʿAbd Shams clan.[565] Muʿāwiya was the fifth descendant of ʿAbd Shams, who was viewed as 'the putative founder of the largest politically cohesive lineage to which Muʿāwiya belonged'.[566]

Muʿāwiya was born in Mecca five years before the open proclamation of the religion of Islam.[567] It was seen as a place of permanent settlement in the late 5th century CE. There were two main sources for the income of the area. The first source of income was gained from its role as the area for the pilgrimage to the Kaʿbah and the second was that it linked the caravan commerce to the Yemen, Syria and Egypt. His father Abū Sufyān supervised his education while Muʿāwiya was growing up in Mecca. Abū Sufyān had maintained a strong reputation in the trade circles of the Arabian Peninsula, Syria and Abyssinia.

There is a difference of opinion concerning when Muʿāwiya converted to Islam. One narration discusses his conversion as taking place before the occupation of Mecca. The narration discusses the fact that he accepted Islam at the treaty of Ḥudaybīyyah. The Prophet had led his companions from Medīna to perform the pilgrimage at Mecca. The Quraysh forces blocked his entry into Mecca, and there was a treaty which was signed and agreed, a treaty which at first looked like a defeat for the Prophet, but later would prove decisive in strengthening his position in Medīna and later in Mecca. If Muʿāwiya accepted Islam at Ḥudaybīyah, this would be a reflection of his sincerity, however, if he accepted Islam a couple of years

[565] On Abū Sufyān, see Ibn Khayyāṭ, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, 297; Ibn Qutaybah, *Kitāb al-maʿārif*, 344; al-Masʿūdī, *al-Tanbīh*; on Hind, see Ibn Khayyāṭ, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, 298.
[566] Humphreys, *Muʿāwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān*, 28-29.
[567] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3, 433.

later, than this would be a sign of a hypocritical timeserver.[568] Furthermore, his acceptance of Islam at Ḥudaybiyyah would be seen as defining him as a companion, rather than a *ṭalīq*. It is the later sources which discuss his conversion at Ḥudaybiyyah. Ibn Ḥajar quotes Muʿāwiya saying:

> I was converted to Islam in the year of ʿUmrat al-Qaḍa' (a minor pilgrimage to Mecca which was known to have taken place in the year 7 AH/627 CE) but I had kept this a secret from my parents because of their threats to cut necessities such as food and drink, and because of this attitude I was not able to leave Mecca to migrate to Medīna.[569]

Ibn ʿAsākir further strengthens this point of a secret conversion where Muʿāwiya again repeats that:

> In the year of al-Ḥudaybiyyah, when Quraysh prevented the Messenger of God from reaching the House, pushed him with the palms of their hands to block his path, then at last signed the treaty with him, Islam made a powerful impression on me. I mentioned this to my mother Hind bt. ʿUtbah, who said, 'Watch out! Do not contradict your father's opinion or make a decision without consulting him. He may well cut off support for you.' My father was away that day at the market of al-Ḥubashah. I accepted Islam but kept this a secret. The Messenger of God entered Mecca in the Year of Conquest and then I announced publically my conversion.[570]

This opinion is backed up with a narration where Abū Bakr testifies that Muʿāwiya gave the pledge of allegiance in Ḥudaybiyyah like everybody else, but questionably, the narration

[568] Motzki, *The Biography of Muhammad*, 240-275.
[569] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3, 433.
[570] Quoted by Hasson, "La conversion de Muʿawiyah b. Abū Sufyān", 219.

states that God had promised paradise for Mu□□wiya.[571] This automatically would raise objections against Ibn □As□kir that a man of his repute would include such a narration, rejected by both Sunn□ and Sh□□□ scholars.

However, al-□abar□ viewed Ab□ Sufy□n, Mu□□wiya and his brother Yaz□d as being counted by the Prophet as being amongst the freedmen, *al-□ulaq□□*,[572] and those whose hearts had been reconciled, '*al-mu'□llafati qul□buhum*'[573] and therefore it seems unlikely that he had converted anytime before the occupation of Mecca at the age of 18[574] in the year 8 AH/628 CE.

Mu□□wiya would serve under the command of his brother Yaz□d until the year 20 AH/641 CE. When Jerusalem was surrendered to the Arabs during the reign of □Umar, Mu□□wiya had the distinction of being a witness to the signing of the peace treaty document.[575] When Yaz□d occupied the cities of Sayd□ and Jubal, Mu□□wiya had accompanied him.[576] Mu□□wiya occupied the town of □Arqa near Tripoli,[577] this being the first campaign which he led.[578] From this victory, Mu□□wiya would become governor of Jordan.[579] Reports differ concerning his ascension to the governorship of the district of Damascus. Certain reports state that he succeeded his brother in the year 18/638 after Yaz□d had died in a plague in □Amw□s.[580] However, the fact that a second report narrates Yaz□d leading the troops in Qaysar□yya in

---

[571] Hasson, "La conversion de Mu□awiyah b. Ab□ Sufy□n", 239-40.
[572] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 1642-3.
[573] Y□suf b. □Abdull□h Ibn □Abd al-Barr, *al-Ist□□□b f□ ma□rifat al-a□□□b*, ed. A. al-Bajj□w□, 4 vols. (Cairo, n.d.), vol. 3, 1416.
[574] Ibn □Abd al-Barr, *al-Ist□□□b*, vol. 3, 1416.
[575] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 2405-61.
[576] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 126.
[577] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 2, 431.
[578] See also Donner, *The Early Islamic Conquests*.
[579] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 2, 535.
[580] Ibn □ajar, *al-I□□bah*, vol. 3, 433.

the year 19/639[581] raises a question in this regard. What is clear is that ʿUmar nominates Muʿāwiya and that Muʿāwiya rules the district for twenty years as well as another twenty as caliph, thereby allowing the conclusion that he became governor in the year 20/641.[582]

Muʿāwiya's first campaign was led against the city of Ascalon (modern day Ashkelon in the Hebrew and ʿAsqalān in the Arabic) in Palestine. Muʿāwiya eventually garrisoned the city after a peace treaty had been made and the city was surrendered.[583] Further movements were made during the summer against the Byzantines where he would reach Ammūriyya, advancing through empty territory in areas like Tartus and Antioch, which he would garrison with troops, guarding against any possible Byzantine attack.[584] Muʿāwiya would receive a salary as governor. There is a difference of opinion within the corpus of narrations regarding his wage. Ibn al-Athīr[585] is of the opinion that it was only 3, 000 and al-Yaʿqūbī[586] reports 5, 000, although it is uncertain whether this was dirhams or dinārs. Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr exaggerates a figure of 10, 000.[587] What seems likely is al-Maqrīzī's concluding figure of 1, 000 dinārs, in accordance with the rates of leaders of Arab tribes and their annual payments at the time.[588]

Muʿāwiya had married the previous wife of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb at a very young age. Her name was Qaryābah bt. Abī Umayyah b. al-

[581] Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb fī rijāl al-ḥadīth* (Beirut, 1968), vol. 2, 333.
[582] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3, 433.
[583] Al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, 140-2.
[584] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 44.
[585] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 2, 502-3.
[586] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 153.
[587] Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Istīʿāb*, vol. 3, 1422.
[588] Ahmad b.ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ,* ed. G. Wiet (Cairo, 1911-2), vol. 1, 95.

Mughīrah al-Makhzūmī but she divorced and married ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr. Muʿāwiya then married Maysūn bt. Baḥdal b. ʿUnayf b. Duljah al-Kalbī. She was from the tribe of Kalb and was of Christian origin. This marriage would strengthen his position amongst the Arab tribes. In the year 22/642, they had their first child, a son by the name of Yazīd and then a daughter called Amīt Rabb al-Mashāriq.[589] He would also marry Kanūr bt. Qaradhah with whom he had two daughters, Ramal and Ṣafīyyah. Moreover, he married Fākhita bt. Qarādhah b. ʿAbd ʿAmr b. ʿAbd Manāf who would give birth to a daughter by the name of Hind and a son by the name of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, hence Muʿāwiya's agnomen Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān.[590]

Two events would lead to Muʿāwiya being nominated as the ruler over the whole of Syria. The first was the death of the governor of Palestine, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Mujazir al-Kinānī. The second was the resignation due to illness of ʿUmayr b. Sa'd al-Anṣārī, who at the times was governor of both Ḥims and Qinnisrīn.[591] Mesopotamia was also placed under Muʿāwiya's governorship.[592] The Qaysites, who had controlled this area, were proving to be very difficult in their flexibility in relation to immigration into the province. Muʿāwiya, in helping ʿUthmān who was facing a difficult position, felt that the vast size of the province and the small number of inhabitants was an equation that had to be changed and he therefore would allow new migrants to the province, providing incentives such as land grants.[593] However, newcomers were not entitled to the rewards of the raids from

[589] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 204.
[590] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 204.
[591] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 391.
[592] M. Adnan Bakhit and Robert Schick, eds., *The History of the Bilād al-Shām During the Umayyad Period*: *Fourth International Conference of the History of Bilād al-Shām* (Amman: University of Jordan and Yarmouk University, 1989.)
[593] Shaban, *Islamic History,* 82-3; see also Patricia Crone, "Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad Period Political Parties?" *DI*, 71 (1994), 1–57.

Armenian territory.[594] Districts under his governorship would have representatives appointed by Mu□□wiya including □Abd al-Ra□m□n b. Kh□lid b. al-Wal□d for □ims and Alqama b. □ak□m al-Kin□n□ in Palestine.[595]

□Uthm□n was caliph for twelve years. A relatively quiet first period was later followed by one of discontent. The discontent seems to emerge in the year 30/650 and arises due to what was interpreted at the time as nepotism and the appointment of relatives into key seats of power.

Amongst those who had raised a cry against Mu□□wiya and □Uthm□n was the revered companion of the Prophet, Ab□ Dharr. Ab□ Dharr felt that money was being accumulated in the hands of a few and that somebody had to speak out against what he perceived as acts of injustice within the Islamic state.[596] Mu□□wiya wrote to □Uthm□n informing him of the problem. Mu□□wiya tried to bribe him through paying him one thousand pieces of silver or gold, but to no avail causing Mu□□wiya to express his puzzled state in a letter to □Uthm□n with the words *'a□dala b□'*. Uthm□n would eventually welcome Ab□ Dharr to Med□na then exile him to al-Rabadha, 200 km to the northeast of Med□na, where he died in the year 32/652.[597]

Many different problems emerged for □Uthm□n during this period. Dissenters from the Qurr□' in K□fah who were causing trouble for the governor Sa□□d b. al-□□□ b. Umayyah.[598] Amongst the

[594] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 172-8.
[595] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 3, 186.
[596] A. J. Cameron, *Ab□ Dharr al-Ghif□r□: An Examination of His Image in the Hagiography of Islam*, Oriental Translation Fund, New Series, vol. 63 (London: Luzac and Co. Ltd. for the Royal Asiatic Society, 1973), xv, 175.
[597] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 2859.
[598] Martin Hinds, "The Murder of the Caliph Uthman", 450-69.

dissenters was M□lik b. al-□□rith, known as al-Ashtar.[599] Narrations differ as to the reasons of the dispute, with the main reason being the dispute over the ownership of the abandoned land of the Saw□d, which the Qurr□' regarded as rightfully theirs.[600] Sa'□d wrote to □Uthm□n who ordered him to send the 'Musayyar□n', those who had been expelled as they would later be known, to Mu□□wiya in Syria. The ten were al-Ashtar al-Nakha□□, □a□□a□ah and Zayd b. □aw□□n al-□Abd□, □□□ b. □amm□l al-□a□□w□, Kumayl b. Ziy□d al-Nakha□□, Jundub b. Zuhayr al-Azd□, al-□□rith b. □Abdull□h al-□amd□n□ and Th□bit b. Qays al-Nakha□□. They met Mu□□wiya who treated them with respect. However, when he asked them about the details of the dispute, they held him by his beard to which he reacted in anger, threatening them with action from his loyal Syrian people.[601] Exchanges would take place between Mu□□wiya and □Uthm□n until □Uthm□n eventually asked him to send them to □Abd al-Ra□m□n b. Kh□lid b. al-Wal□d in □ims.[602] Again they were treated with respect, yet to no avail. They were not willing to pledge allegiance and obey the caliph. □Uthm□n's governors all gathered in Med□na to discuss the situation. There was no decision taken, however, Mu□□wiya did ask □Uthm□n to come with him to Syria or send him an army for protection, both of which were not acted upon.[603] Rebels began to appear from different parts of the Islamic state including Egypt and K□fah. □Uthm□n b. al-□□□ al-Thaqaf□ asked □Uthm□n to flee to Mu□□wiya where he would surely be under greater protection, an offer which is refused by □Uthm□n.[604] In his most difficult position, he sent for Mu□□wiya's help.

---

[599] Muḥammad b. □Al□ Ibn A□tham, *Kit□b al-Fut□□*, Istanbul Manuscript, Library of Ahmet III, no. 2956, 2 vols. vol. 1, 8a.
[600] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f,* vol. 5, 43.
[601] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 3, 144.
[602] Al-□abar□, *al-T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 2920.
[603] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, vol. 5, 44.
[604] Ibn A□tham, *Fut□□*, vol. 1, 188.

Mu□□wiya sent 1,000 men under the leadership of □ab□b b. Maslamah. However,□Uthm□n was besieged and killed in the year 35/656.

For a period of five days after the death of the caliph, Med□na was left without a leader. The people would then pay allegiance to □Al□ b. Ab□ □□lib who was opposed from the outset by □al□a, al-Zubayr and □□*□*isha. □Al□ was victorious at the Battle of the Camel with the people of Iraq, □ij□z, Egypt and Khur□s□n paying allegiance. However, it was Mu□□wiya and the people of Syria who did not pay allegiance. Mu□□wiya did not participate in any way in the Battle of the Camel.[605] □Al□ wanted to remove Mu□□wiya and replace him with □Abdull□h b. □Abb□s, but Mu□□wiya had refused. Sources indicate that □Al□ refused the advice of Mugh□rah b. Shu□bah al-Thaqaf□[606] who believed that Mu□□wiya should be kept in office due to his power in Syria and the fact that he was appointed by □Umar. □Al□ continued to try and depose Mu□□wiya from the governorship of Syria. He sent a number of emissaries to carry out this task. He sent Sahl b. □unayf, who was his governor in Med□na, to Syria to replace Mu□□wiya, but it was at Tab□k that he met Mu□□wiya's soldiers and returned back to Med□na.[607] Miswar b. Makhramah al-Zuhr□ and Jar□r b. □Abdull□h al-Bajal□ were also sent; Jar□r being asked by Mu□□wiya to write to □Al□ to confirm his position as governor in return for a pledge of allegiance which □Al□ once again refused.[608]

It was in this period that a number of key figures played a major role in developing Mu□□wiya's aspirations to resist □Al□'s

[605] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 3099-3100.
[606] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, 172; al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 3083; al-Ma□s□d□, *Mur□j*, vol. 4, 342.
[607] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 3087; Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 3, 161.
[608] Na□r b. Muza□im al-Minq□r□, *Waq□at □iff□n*, ed. A.M. Harun (Cairo, 1382 AH), 52.

demands and make overtures for the caliphate. N□□ilah bt. al-Far□f□□ah had written to Mu□□wiya, describing to him the final moments of □Uthm□n's life and the fact that those who besieged his house were from tribes such as Khuz□□ah, Juhaynah and Muzaynah.[609] Al-Nu□m□n b. Bash□r al-An□□r□ carried □Uthm□n's shirt and Na□□lah's severed fingers from Med□na to Syria.[610]

Mu□□wiya therefore was advised to make some key political decisions. His brother □Utbah b. Ab□ Sufy□n advised him to recall the renowned companion □Amr b. al-□□□. □Amr had withdrawn from the political affairs of the day,[611] and was not necessarily seen as a supporter of □Uthm□n, who had removed him from his previous post in Egypt. He resided in a farm in Ajl□n, Palestine. The decision to appoint □Amr was a key political move in strengthening his cause. □Amr knew the only way to challenge □Al□ was to seek revenge for the murder of □Uthm□n; if □Amr would remain loyal to Mu□□wiya, then Egypt would return to him. Egypt was not only previously under his control but was also a trade route which he had ventured through even before Islam.[612] □Amr was the outstanding assistant to Mu□□wiya's cause.

Mu□□wiya sought to raise the emotional fervour of the Syrians by raising □Uthm□n's bloodstained shirt and Na□□lah's fingers in the mosque in Damascus. Having ensured the support of the masses, Mu□□wiya now sought vengeance for the blood of □Uthm□n and called for an election of a caliph through the *sh□r□* system. Shurahbil b. al-□im□, □ab□b b. Maslamah al-Fihr□ and Ma□□n b. Yaz□d b. al-Akhnas al-Sulam□ were sent as ambassadors to □Al□ to

609 Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, vol. 5, 99.
610 Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 3255.
611 Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, 184.
612 Ab□ □Umar Mu□ammad b. Y□suf al-Kind□, *Kit□b al-Wul□t wa Kit□b al-Qu□□t*, ed. R. Guest (Leiden, 1912), 6-10.

explain these demands. Mu□□wiya's demands were refused by □Al□ who viewed the Syrian governor as a rebel and was now prepared to fight him.[613] Different reasons have been given as to why Mu□□wiya wanted to engage in battle. One opinion is his demand for vengeance, another is his claim to the caliphate. Shaban offers a third reason, uniquely discussing the migration situation at the time and the admission of immigrants into Syrian lands. [614]

In Syria, Mu□□wiya had been a governor for over a decade. Tribes were extremely loyal to him. Firstly, he had married Mays□n. Christians had enjoyed a period of freedom and respect under Mu□□wiya's rule. He used these ties to negotiate with the Byzantines to allow him to move troops freely into Iraqi territory.[615] Furthermore, men such as al-□a□□k b. Qays al-Fihr□ and □usayn b. Numayr al-Sak□n□ were prominent leaders of clans whose support was vital.[616] The army was very disciplined and organised with clan leaders in control of its members.

Mu□□wiya would not acknowledge □Al□'s authority. □iff□n, where the two armies met, was originally a Roman site to the west of Raqqa. This battle is key to understanding the different opinions concerning leadership and authority in early Islam as well as helping to historiographically understand Mu□□wiya's caliphate. For nearly two months, with their respective armies both camped at □iff□n, the disputes between the rival factions could not be settled.

The month of Mu□arram, recognised as a period of peace in pre-

[613] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 3277.
[614] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 74.
[615] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 159-60f.
[616] Ibn Khayya□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 179.

Islamic Arabia and cemented within Islamic thought and culture, saw the emergence of a period of truce. On the 8th of Safar 37 AH, fierce skirmishes ensued in what would be known as the stormy night, or *laylat al-harīr*. The fight began on Wednesday and ended on Saturday.[617]

Al-Ashtar had made major inroads into the heart of Muʿāwiya's army, and was getting closer to Muʿāwiya himself. The closer he got the more Muʿāwiya considered escaping and running away.[618] ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ intervened with a plan. He asked Muʿāwiya to order the troops to raise the Qurʾān on their lances. The Qurʾān was to decide their differences, for it is the book of God. The cry then emerged that not only was the Qurʾān the decider and the settler of the dispute, but also the people of Syria were the defenders of the frontiers and therefore if they died who would defend the nation from the threat of the Byzantines and the Turks?[619] The divisions and dissension which had earlier plagued ʿAlī's army did not help him convince his soldiers that this was a ploy and a trick of Muʿāwiya and ʿAmr. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ was chosen by Muʿāwiya for the arbitration in choosing who should become caliph.

After a period of negotiations, Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī assumed that ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ had agreed with him on a decision that would see the abdication of ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya.[620] ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, however, decided to nominate Muʿāwiya and depose ʿAlī. Historians depict a foolish Abū Mūsā who began an exchange of insults with ʿAmr.[621] Abū Mūsā left after the arbitration and headed, seemingly out of

[617] Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 176.
[618] Al-Dīnawarī, *al-Akhbār al-Tiwāl*, 189; al-Maʿsūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 4, 379.
[619] Al-Maʿsūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 4, 379; al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, 190.
[620] Al-Maʿsūdī, *Murūj,* vol. 4, 399; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil,* vol. 3, 277.
[621] Naṣr, *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn,* 546.

fear, towards Mecca.[622] ʿAmr returned victorious to the camp of Muʿāwiya. However, ʿAlī refused to abdicate after having been informed of the decision by ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAbbās. ʿAlī now faced disturbances from the east in the form of the Khārijites and from Muʿāwiya in the west. ʿAlī defeated the Khārijites at Nahrawān and ensured the wounded would return to their tribes.[623]

In Egypt, ʿAlī sought to reinforce his position with the appointment of Mālik al-Ashtar al-Nakhaʿī. However, he was poisoned before entering Egypt at the Suez.[624] ʿAmr became governor of Egypt.[625] Egypt was a major pawn for Muʿāwiya. He now mounted a number of raids on ʿAlī's territory. Some of these raids however were brutal. Bisr b. Arṭāh al-Fihrī burnt houses in the process of occupying Medīna, whose governor, the revered Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī escaped without any resistance.[626] ʿUbaydullāh b. ʿAbbās fled when Bisr entered Yemen. Further trauma was to be experienced by ʿUbaydullāh when his sons were killed by Bisr in ʿan'ā'.[627] The Yemen and ʿijāz would be returned to ʿAlī's rule, however, when news of this incident lead to the appointment of Wahb b. Masʿūd al-Khathʿamī and two thousand men moving to Najrān. There they defeated Bisr.[628] Muʿāwiya's attempt to win the support of the Meccans was countered with ʿAlī's appointment of Maʿqil b. Qays al-Riyāḥī and three thousand men. However, on this occasion, a battle did not take place.[629]

ʿAlī was killed from the injury of the strike of a poisoned

[622] Al-Maʿsūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 4, 400; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 279.
[623] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 3389.
[624] Al-Maʿsūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 4, 422-3; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 1, 296.
[625] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 221.
[626] Al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 5, 56.
[627] Al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 5, 57; al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 3452.
[628] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 324.
[629] Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, vol. 1, 135B.

sword while engrossed in prayer.[630] ʿAlī was succeeded by his son al-Ḥasan. For the first two months, al-Ḥasan remained in Kūfah and made no inroads to Syria. Muʿāwiya's plans to attack Anbār[631] under the leadership of ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar b. Kurayz led al-Ḥasan to leave for al-Madāʾin as head of the army. ʿUbaydullāh b. ʿAbbās and Qays b. Saʿd al-Anṣārī led the army in fighting the Syrians at the Jazīra province. Having reached al-Mawṣil, Muʿāwiya sent a group of his men under the leadership of al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah al-Thaqafī to discuss a peace settlement, a blank piece of paper sent with the request to stipulate his terms.[632]

The dissension which affected the ranks of his father's army were to virtually destroy his own leadership and stand. One million dirhams was what would lead ʿUbaydullāh b. ʿAbbās, al-Ḥasan's cousin, to defect and join Muʿāwiya's army.[633] Even more damaging was the attack of al-Jarrāḥ b. Sinān al-Asadī which wounded al-Ḥasan.[634] Many began to leave al-Ḥasan and he therefore was resigned to sending ʿAbdullāh b. Nawfal b. al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭallib b. Hāshim to discuss a peace settlement.[635] The revenues of two cultivated Persian regions, Nasā and Dārābjerd, and five million dirhams from the treasury, were to be given as part of the agreement. However, the revenue of Dārābjerd would not reach al-Ḥasan.[636] Al-Ḥasan would eventually abdicate, with al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah al-Thaqafī governing Kūfah and ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar governing Baṣra. Muʿāwiya

[630] Al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 4, 426.
[631] Dīnawarī, *al-Akhbār al-Tiwāl*, 216.
[632] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil,* vol. 3, 340; Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 3; Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, vol. 1, 161A.
[633] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 214; Abū al-Faraj ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn Isfahani, *Maqatil al* (Najaf: al-Maktabah al-Ḥaydarīyah, 1965), 64.
[634] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 215
[635] Ibn Aʿtham, *Futūḥ*, vol. 1, 161B.
[636] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 341.

was proclaimed as ʾAmīr al-Muʾminīn in Jerusalem in 41 AH/661 CE, the year known as *ʿĀm al-jamāʿah*,[637] the year of unity with everyone - except the Khārijites.[638]

The period of his twenty years reign as caliph of the Islamic community included decisions which would be viewed as controversial. Busr b. Abū Arṭāh was sent to Yemen in the year 40 Hijra. The *Wālī* of Yemen at the time was ʿUbaydullāh b. ʿAbbās. These people were loyal to ʿAlī. He captured their men and subjected their women to horrendous torture. Busr had captured the women of Hamadān, who were sincere lovers of the Prophet's family, and took them to the market with naked legs. Whoever had longer legs was sold with a higher price. They were the first Muslim women to have been taken as captives.[639] Furthermore, Ḥasan b. ʿAlī, the grandson of the Prophet, was poisoned due to the order of Muʿāwiya.

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Madāʾinī has said that:

> Al-Ḥasan died in 49 hijra, when he was forty seven years old. He was ill for forty days before his death. Muʿāwiya asked Jaʿda bt. al-Ashʿath to insert poison into him. Muʿāwiya said to her if you kill him with poison, I will give you one hundred thousand dirhams and I will marry you to Yazīd. When al-Ḥasan died, he did not give her Yazīd, as he stated that if she was willing to kill her husband, she would definitely kill his son.[640]

Indeed, according to Abū Bakr b. Ḥafṣ, the famous Medīnan narrator, Muʿāwiya not only poisoned al-Ḥasan but also poisoned

---

[637] Al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 5, 14; Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 5.
[638] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 78.
[639] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 6, 59-60.
[640] ʿIzz al-Dīn Abū Ḥamīd Ibn Abū al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ Nahjul Balāgha* (Cairo: Dār al-kutub al-ʿArabīyyah, 1944), vol. 4, 4.

the famous companion Sa□d b. Ab□ Waqq□s.[641] This decision, however, which is the most questionable when examining his biography, would also concern his son Yaz□d, ultimately raising a question concerning his *□ilm*. Although agreeing in the peace treaty with al-Hasan that he would not choose Yaz□d to be his successor, Mu□□wiya broke his covenant and went ahead with the appointment. Historical records point to the terrible nature and ways of Yaz□d. A known drunkard and womanizer, who was always playing with monkeys and drinking wine, Yaz□d was the person responsible for the killing of the beloved grandson of the Prophet, Husayn. Ibn al-□iq□aq□ says in his book that the savagery caused by Yaz□d in Med□na meant that when a daughter wanted to get married, her father could not guarantee her virginity and would say that she might be violated during the event known as al-□□rrah.[642] It is narrated that more than one thousand virgins of Med□na had become pregnant because of the libertinism of the army of Yaz□d.

These decisions have to be examined in order to be able to dissect his authority and leadership as caliph of the Islamic state and are key to understanding the different arguments and debates that would emerge from both classical as well as modern scholarship. This sketch of his biography from the classical sources will be analysed alongside the different genres of literature from the 3rd to the 6th centuries AH/9th to the 12th centuries CE to allow us to have both a thorough understanding and appreciate the nature of leadership in the formative period of Islamic history. An overview is also needed of how modern scholars have sought to analyse and present Mu□□wiya's reign. In

[641] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, vol. 1, 404.
[642] Ibn al-□iq□aq□, *al-Fakhr□ f□ al-adab al-sul□□n□yah wal duwal al-isl□m□yya* (Cairo: al-Maktaba al-tijariya al-kubr□, 1927), 107.

these discourses, it would be interesting to note how attributes such as *ʿilm*, *shujāʿa* and *ʿilm* are assessed in light of key decisions that were undertaken during Muʿāwiya's caliphate.

Modern Arab Scholarship on Muʿāwiya

ʿAqqād

In reviewing modern arab scholarship on Muʿāwiya, the first work to be examined is that of ʿAbbas Aqqād. ʿAqqād's view of history is a reflection of his sense of personal decency as a historian and literary critic. ʿAqqād is one of the giants of the 20th century and a renowned figure in the illumination of human thought. He lived for more than eighty years enriching cultural, social, and political life in Egypt. He is seen as a unique encyclopedic figure, self-educated, he used to read within different fields of knowledge, and wrote within various spheres, distinguishing himself as a writer, thinker, poet, historian and journalist. ʿAqqād initiated many political and cultural debates for the sake of national freedom and the advancement of learning, knowledge and freedom of thought, thus identifying his greatness with that of the issues and thoughts he propounded. To ʿAqqād, the historian represents fairness, not just themselves or those whom they love or have an affinity for.[643]

ʿAqqād states that his book does not intend to examine his life or give a detailed biographical account of his movements. Rather it is a recognition of his place in history, and a discussion which intends that justice be granted to historical truth and searches for humanitarian truth in the same way a research

[643] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 14.

student would carry out their work. Post-Umayyad historians, he believes, do not achieve this. He despises the fact that they do not see the way their prejudice emerges in their writing, stating that it as if they are 'employed by government, are paid by government, defending government for their own personal opinions to continue'.[644] While pointing to the fact that he will not mention names, Aqqād says that some contemporary historians[645] show blind love for the men that they admire. Therefore, they do not discuss some of the most important issues in this area or give conclusions which would highlight their opinions.

These historians do not see any problem in Muāwiya warring with ʿAlī, yet they see a major problem in Muslims rising against his son Yazīd - a clear confusion as to the role of the caliph. Furthermore, these historians are willing to blame the people of Medīna for not defending themselves against the onslaught of Yazīd and his soldiers instead of questioning the arrogance of the oppressor within the vicinity of Islam's holiest sites.

ʿAqqād first examines Hind, Muāwiya's mother. Within the anecdote of her daughter's marriage, she is described as strong willed. Furthermore, she was infamous for her eating of the liver of the Prophet's uncle Ḥamzah at Uḥud. Certain traits are seen to be inherited not only from his parents, Hind and Abū Sufyān, but from his grandparents as well. His learning comes through his company with the kings, although ʿAqqād questions whether he was really a scribe of the Qurʾān considering ʿUthmān did not ask advice from him in matters of collection.[646] What

[644] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 13.
[645] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 13.
[646] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 109.

ʿAqqād does not doubt was that he had a memory for poetry and famous proverbs. He presents his father as submitting to Islam at the age of 23, with the victory at Mecca. Was this under duress or doubt? ʿAqqād does not think so. He calls him a man 'who prays, fasts, pays the taxes, goes to pilgrimage, reads and listens to the Qurʾān and that before he died he had a nail of the Prophet as well as hairs from his beard'.[647]

Muʿāwiya, according to ʿAqqād, is often credited as being a man of both *dahāʾ* and *ʿilm*. ʿAqqād recognises the importance of these two traits. When examining Arab tradition, he admits that personalities are often judged according to their ability to employ these traits in their decisions and social conduct. Traditions seek to define these traits, discuss their usage and the success of those personalities who employed them. *ʿilm* had an important place within Arabic tradition. It was seen in certain circles as a replacement for strength and bravery. To others it was a sign of fear. The question ʿAqqād poses is whether or not ʿilm is a positive trait. Is *ʿilm* deceit, or is it the basis of trickery and deception?[648]

Therefore, some of the most notorious politicians are analysed, namely ʿAmr b. al-ʿāṣ, Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah and Ziyād b. Abīh. The question again is posed, did Muʿāwiya use them for his own interests or did they use Muʿāwiya to get what they wanted? Who here exhibited the real *ʿilm*? According to ʿAqqād, it was the ʿilm of these three that led them to Muʿāwiya, rather than Muʿāwiya managing to reach them. They knew what they wanted and so did he. But did he outwit them? ʿAqqād does not believe he

[647] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 114.
[648] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 28.

did.[649]

The argument which is posed is that Ziyād b. Abīh already had assumed a position in the past, a man notorious for not knowing who his father was until Muʿāwiya informed him that it was Abū Sufyān who had been with his mother. At the time, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ and Mughīrah had no power, no money, and no army. Who was going to help them? None other than Muʿāwiya.[650] They benefited and took more from him than he benefited and took from them. ʿAmr had been, according to ʿAqqād, hesistant to join Muʿāwiya's forces, but Egypt was too great to lose, and Muʿāwiya eventually gave him what he wanted. Mughīrah was buying and selling fish, having been removed from his post as governor of Kūfah because of accusations of adultery. He wanted Kūfah back. This he managed to get after persuading Muʿāwiya that having ʿAmr and his sons as governors of two of the main cities was like putting 'yourself between the lions'.[651]

What at times he thought was *ʿilm* was thrown back at him. Not only would he employ people who had committed heinous crimes, such as ʿUbaydullāh b. ʿUmar, but one particular incident displayed where his *ʿilm* took him. When ʿAlī's brother ʿAqīl went to Muʿāwiya for help, and Muʿāwiya helped him, Muʿāwiya told him, I am kinder to you than my brother. ʿAqīl replied in the affirmative, then stated:

> My brother put his religion before the world, whereas you put your world before your religion.[652]

---

649 Shaban, *Islamic History*, 31.
650 Shaban, *Islamic History*, 32.
651 Shaban, *Islamic History*, 35.
652 Shaban, *Islamic History*, 39.

To ʿAqqād, Muʿāwiya had followed the *ʿilm* of the tyrants - that of divide and conquer - yet in this case, it was between Muslims.[653] The government was built on deceit. He would listen to ʿAmr, then Mughīrah, then ʿAmr. He would know of their disagreements, and help one against the other. This was not the definition of greatness to ʿAqqād.[654] A notable incident is that of Marwān's appointment in Medīna.

The community had been split. Groups were formed. Disunity was rife. Meccans and Medinites. Iraqis and Syrians. The people of Yemen and people of Mudhar of the Arab tribes.[655] The tribes of Kalb and Qays. Deceit was employed to eliminate enemies. Amongst these enemies was the grandson of the Prophet, Ḥasan b. ʿAlī, Mālik al-Ashtar and Qays. ʿAqqād displays clear references as to historians who narrate the ways Ḥasan was poisoned by his wife on Muʿāwiya's instruction, amongst them Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī.

Furthermore, ʿAqqād discusses the deaths of these companions, including ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khālid b. al-Walīd. What this revealed was that, unlike ʿAmr who would attack and retreat, to ʿAqqād, Muʿāwiya attacked and attacked.[656] Having waited patiently for the moment to display his abilities, when it came, he took it.

ʿAqqād believes that *ʿilm* is the most important trait after that of *dahāʾ*. Not only does he state that it is the trait by which many historians seek to praise Muʿāwiya, but also that Muʿāwiya would enjoy to be seen as being a man who could see an

[653] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 40.
[654] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 41.
[655] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 43.
[656] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 51.

opportunity and take it, yet be patient at the same time. As long as the people's opinions did not affect his or his family's kingship, then they could live freely. ʿAqqād describes *ḥilm* as a 'propaganda stunt' in the face of the piety and strength of ʿAlī.[657] This was a trait seen as vital in any leader for the Arabs. Muʿāwiya wanted people to acknowledge that ʿAlī was a man of bravery, piety and part of the Prophet's family, but that *ḥilm* was his own personal quality and one to be acknowledged by all. To ʿAqqād, *ḥilm* was a vital link in Muʿāwiya's building his reputation and love with the people of the time. He quotes Muʿāwiya's famous line that if an 'Ummayad is not forbearant, then he has broken his origin and diverted from the path of his fathers'.[658] ʿAqqād displays this trait in Umayyad history. Ḥarb b. Umayyah made peace between the Quraysh and Hawāzin in the days of pre-Islamic Arabia.

ʿAqqād presents a serious of narrations which he claims portray *ḥilm* in a positive sense, positive if the chain of the narration is not examined or a comparison is not made with a lengthier narration elsewhere. Within this comes an interesting discussion on his approach to Zayd b. ʿUmar and his confrontation with Busr b. Arṭāt as well as the contradictory narrations regarding Ibn ʿAbbās political manouevres in favour of Muʿāwiya against ʿAlī. What ʿAqqād shows is that some of these narrations are misused, misinterpreted or simply not placed within their proper context. What may look like a self-explanatory narration requires further study. To ʿAqqād, forbearance was defined as a positive trait, indicating a man of patience who can restrain his anger. Yet simply restraining anger is not forbearance. Forbearance is the display of patience when in power and with all citizens of the

[657] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 53.
[658] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 55.

state being equal under your justice.[659] Forbearance means not giving in to the power of anger yet not dismissing its presence completely. There is, according to ʿAqqād, a vital point in defining forbearance and that is intention. Is one forbearant in order to build humanity as a whole and let others take this as an example for their lives or is this virtue simply used as a public show?

ʿAqqād stresses that the most beautiful statement defining forbearance is that 'you control anger and anger does not control you'.[660] This is why he concludes by stating that the only time his forbearance was really tested was with ʿujr and his companions, and here his anger was certainly not curtailed, as he narrates through Ibn al-Athīr the events that led to the unfortunate execution because of Ziyād's Friday sermon.[661] As Muʿāwiya himself stated, 'The sultan has the anger of a youth but takes the takings of a lion'.[662]

To ʿAqqād, one cannot examine and place Muʿāwiya between the scales of justice were they not to analyse his role in the civil war in the time of ʿUthmān. What made Muʿāwiya so determined to wage war with ʿAlī? Muʿāwiya did not listen to the advice of anyone when ʿUthmān was facing difficulties. The basis of disagreement in the time of ʿUthmān was the way the finances were spent and the question of nepotism.[663] Muʿāwiya not only received his stipend, but had always sought and asked for more, to the extent that revered companions such as Abū Dharr would

[659] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 68.
[660] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 69.
[661] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 73.
[662] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 78.
[663] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 93.

question his greed.[664]

Mu□□wiya's diplomacy with Uthman's enemies differs with that of □Abd al-Ra□m□n b. Kh□lid. Mu□□wiya, □Aqq□d states, was protecting himself first before anyone else.[665] He was willing to kill □Al□, □alha and Zubayr, companions of the Prophet - advice which he offered to □Uthm□n before his death and which the third caliph promptly rejected. His proposal to send four thousand troops to protect □Uthm□n is to □Aqq□d further sign of his seeking power over □ij□z as well as Sh□m. His third proposal of taking blood revenge cannot simply be administered by anyone. It has to go though the court of law. His asking of seeking blood revenge is his asking for the caliphate and the constitutional powers within it. The fact remains for □Aqq□d that Mu□□wiya, who had been a governor for twenty years, could mobilize an army to defend □Uthm□n. Why then the lack of help? For □Aqq□d, Ab□ al-□ufayl's words to Mu□□wiya pose this very question.[666] □Aqq□d explains that the historian has to use insight to see the picture clearly with no emotion.[667] The intentions of Mu□□wiya were for himself and his worldly gain.

Having praised □Umar's victory and policy of expansion, as well as providing □Uthm□n with a defence against the accusation of weakness by looking at his powers at sea, □Aqq□d's discussion looks at Mu□□wiya in relation to the Persians and Byzantine forces. He begins by describing his 'training' under his brother Yaz□d.[668] A discussion then looks at his mobilizing of forces to seek revenge for □Uthm□n; □Aqq□d looks at his withdrawal of

[664] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 94.
[665] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 95.
[666] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 101.
[667] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 101.
[668] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 121.

water at Ṣiffīn, then states that although every sermon in the years of revolt against ʿAlī focused on Uthman's death, this was little heard once he assumed power.[669] His raising the book on spears does not help except in causing the eventual death of ʿAlī by the revolters.

Furthermore, in discussing his period in relation to the Byzantine's, there is a mention of a life of luxury and extravagance in the face of opposition empires. He would display his garments, clear for all to view, in a style of grandeur. He would enjoy nights of pleasure and fun. According to ʿAqqād, this, however, did not stop him from staying in in the early hours to read the letters of the people and their complaints. He was particular about what he did and when.[670] Governors were well paid by the treasury, rarely did they change, and government officials were always ready to use force. His actions were that of a policy of divide and conquer: the issues of the Shīʿa and the Khawārij, Arab tribes fighting each other, the famous incident of Saʿd b. Qays and Marwān, alongside the differentiation between Arabs and non-Arabs.[671] Governors such as Ziyād instilled fear into the masses with fiery speeches, revealing the rhetoric and stances of his leader which eventually lead to the deaths of notable companions. For ʿAqqād, the politics of division was placed alongside the politics of coercion,[672] seen with a presentation of his will to Yazīd.[673] This was Muʿāwiya's way.

> A certain trickery by which wonderful achievements were attained, was frequently practiced by Muʿāwiya against Muslim, as well as

[669] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 121.
[670] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 123.
[671] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 126.
[672] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 129.
[673] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 130.

> non-Muslim, rivals. This trickery was mainly depending upon ceaseless work of creating discrepancies and despondency among the adversary party. This was carried out by throwing seditious matters and arising malice in the lines of the adversary party. The same trickery was actually used against people of his family and relatives. He could not tolerate noticing any concord between any two individuals. The natural competition between his most remarkable enemies could support him in accomplishing the trickery of throwing animosity among them.

Al-□Askar□

Another of the contemporary works about Mu□□wiya is that of Sayyid Murta□□ al-□Askar□ in his work, *□□□isha's Role in the History of Islam*.[674] Al-□Askar□'s works have very clear characteristics. His opinions are very precise and references are readily provided. Amongst the known characteristics of his work is that they are free from prejudice and partiality. On the second level, there is a constant reliance on first-hand primary sources rather than relying on books written from the 5th century onwards. Indeed, Dr. □afn□, one of the professors of literature in Egypt, comments on this area as quoted by Mu□ammad Jawidan:

> The scholar and expert of comparative history collects highly scientific facts from many works and books, and he has stepped on every scene in history in order to discover forgotten truths. This master investigator tries to prove his points by basing them on the arguments presented on the writings of anti-Sh□□□ scholars. In this way he chooses the shortest route to vanquish the enemies of Im□m□yyah through their own arguments.[675]

---

[674] S. M. al-□Askar□, *The Role of □□□isha in the History of Islam: □□□isha in the Time of Mu□□wiya b. Ab□ Sufy□n,* tr. Dr. □Al□□ al-D□n P□z□rg□d□ (Iran: Naba Organization, 2000).
[675] Al-□Askar□, *The Role of □□□isha*, Introduction, 12 .

Al-ʿAskarī introduces his historiographic research by highlighting the aim of his survey:

> The period in which Muʿāwiya ruled as compared with other eras and centuries in the life of Islam, has possessed a special distinction from the viewpoint of an overall interpolation brought about in the basic principles of Islam. For the Umayyad government used all its massive power for the fabrication of traditions and forging of narrations and started the large factory of tradition making with the aid of its hirelings including some companions of the Prophet and its own agents.[676]

Al-ʿAskarī reflects ʿAqqād's comments in that what we learn about Umayyad history is shaped by the rulers, their agents or their followers. Therefore, al-ʿAskarī saw it as vital:

> to adopt an analytical method of survey in studying this period and its distinguished rulers and personalities in order to pave the way for the correct evaluation of the traditions fabricated in this period.[677]

As with other works, the discussion begins with a clear discussion on Muʿāwiya's lineage, with reference again to Abū Sufyān and Hind's positions in Arabian circles. References are given to Hind's antics at Uḥud and Abū Sufyān's leadership at Khandaq, two of the early Islamic battles.[678] Furthermore, in contrast to other pieces of Arab historiography, there is a continuation of an examination in relation to Abū Sufyān's

[676] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 17.
[677] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 17.
[678] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 32.

stances in the period of the first three caliphs.[679] Al-ʿAskarī points to the period of ʿUthmān as being a decisive point in the turnaround of Umayyad fortunes,[680] narrating an interesting report, through *al-Istīʿāb*, about Abū Sufyān's newly found power:

> O Sons of Umayyah! Since the time the caliphate had fallen into the hands of the men of the Taym and ʿAdi tribes, I coveted that position. Now that it has fallen into your hands, you should take turns in seizing it, in the same way that children pass a ball to one another. I swear to God that there exists neither a heaven nor a hell.[681]

Al-ʿAskarī further points to the passing of the tomb of Ḥamzah, uncle of the Prophet and arch-enemy of Abū Sufyān, where Abū Sufyān lashed out and kicks it.[682] To al-ʿAskarī, this evidence clearly proves that the conversion of Abū Sufyān and his close inner circle was out of fear and that the sincerity in submission was not to be seen. Furthemore, in examining Muʿāwiya, and his relationship to the Prophet, the incident of the curse of the stomach is once again narrated as a prophecy of later gluttony.[683] Other prophecies are mentioned, possibly more than any other discussion on Muʿāwiya's place in Arab historiography, mention is given in relation to Muʿāwiya's turning the needy away and living lavishly:

> You see, we are living in a land where there are many enemy spies (Romans) and it is necessary to frighten them with our pomp and

[679] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 43.
[680] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 45.
[681] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 45.
[682] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 46.
[683] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha*, 48.

glory.[684]

Al-ʿAskarī points to the tension between Muʿāwiya and Abū Dharr and concludes that he displays a lack of *ʿilm* in the way he deals with the revered companion. Abū Dharr sought to enjoin the good and forbid the evil in face of the treachery that was occurring with public funds. He spoke out against the caliph and then was exiled to Shām where Muʿāwiya was not ready to entertain him. Abū Dharr would protest when seeing the enormous palaces built, but to no avail. Al-ʿAskarī discusses the area in depth with many narrations relating to the bribes which were offered to silence his views. He also concludes that it is as if Muʿāwiya had little knowledge of the rank of Abū Dharr in Islam. Al-ʿAskarī also analyses the fact that attributions to Sayf b. ʿUmar here are not justified in offering excuses for Muʿāwiya. This he does through a thorough examination of the primary sources at hand.[685] Ṣiffīn is then examined, where he believes Muʿāwiya does not display any courage on the battlefield . Furthermore, when assessing the motives for peace with al-Ḥasan, to al-ʿAskarī, the treaty was, in the long term, ultimately Muʿāwiya's loss. The more he broke the terms of the treaty, the clearer his aims at the beginning would become. [686]

Muʿāwiya's treatment of those who opposed, or who were not simply within, the Umayyad regime is examined. Taxes were unfairly laid upon the innocent, according to al-ʿAskarī, where he looks at the corruption displayed in taking Baṣra and the surrounding environs as his own land as well as confiscating the crown properties of the Sassanid kings around Kūfah. He further encroached the lands of Yemen and Mesopotamia, taking possession

[684] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha*, 51.
[685] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 61.
[686] Al-ʿAskarī, *The Role of ʿĀʾisha,* 94.

of lands which had been fiefs and public domains.[687] For example, the land of Fadak, which originally belonged to F□□ima, daughter of the Prophet, which was seen as a fief then given to Marw□n. Not only was their corruption on an economic level, but al-□Askar□, similar to previous historians, discusses the molestation of the companions of the Prophet and □Al□, notably the killing of □ujr.[688] People such as al-Mugh□rah were employed to kill, torture or even simply molest the enemies of government. Yaz□d's appointment, to □al-Askari, was confirmation of the continuation of this line, with the allegiances demanded for his caliphate discussed, particularly the allegiance of the people of Med□na and Ba□ra.[689]

Al-Am□n□

Another one of the Arab historians who examines Mu□□wiya is al-Am□n□ in volume ten of his eleven-volume encyclopedia, *al-Ghad□r*.[690] His first analysis, in contrast to other Arab historians who tend to begin from lineage, begins with a chapter entitled, "Exaggerations in the Merits of Mu□□wiya ibn Ab□ Sufy□n". He discusses areas where merits are given which are contradictory and which he describes as being 'narrated in dreams or in an imaginary realm'.[691] Furthermore, in contrast to the Arab historians which have already been discussed, al-Am□n□ discusses the chain of every narration which he has used and employs narrations from the corpus of the books of all sects. In a science known as the biography of the narrators, al-Am□n□ gives detailed accounts of the lives of each narrator as well as

[687] Al-ʿAskar□, *The Role of □□□isha*, 111.
[688] Al-ʿAskar□, *The Role of □□□isha*, 113.
[689] Al-ʿAskar□, *The Role of □□□isha*, 117.
[690] □Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Am□n□, *al-Ghad□r fil Kit□b wal Sunnah wal Adab* (Qum: Fur□ al-D□n Publishers, 1995), vol. 10.
[691] Al-Am□n□, *al-Ghad□r*, vol. 10, 198.

their political inclination and trustworthiness, in adducing the reliability of the given narration.

The next chapter is aptly titled, and is similar to the works of ʿAqqād, "*Muʿāwiya fī mīzān al-Qaḍāʾ*", or "Muʿāwiya in the Scales of Justice". The first statement by al-Amīn is to point out that the narrations collected about Muʿāwiya are from the Prophet's closest companions, those who are seen to have upheld the first generation of Islamic thought and principles.[692] He then examines another set of clear violation of Islamic teachings, highlighting the lack of knowledge of religious precepts, by Muʿāwiya, as narrated by all Islamic sects, with the chains provided for each narration. Amongst the violations, including his conduct with alcohol, interest, praying Friday prayer on Wednesday, payment of blood money to non-Muslims in an Islamic state, the sermon of ʿEid before prayer and neglecting punishing the thief.[693] Furthermore, in line with other Arabic historians, he discusses the sucessorship of Yazīd and its being sanctioned by Muʿāwiya. An examination is provided of the opinion of the companions, the affect this had on the lives of the nation, and Yazīd's character.[694]

Al-Amīn examines the rise of Muʿāwiya against ʿAlī. Having stated that many people say that Muʿāwiya did this in avenging the death of ʿUthmān, he then begins asking a series of questions. These question seek to highlight the point that ʿAlī was made a scapegoat in the jostling for power between some of the most notable names in Islam. Al-Amīn asks why it is that these figures, from that day until the time of writing, figures

[692] Al-Amīn, *al-Ghadīr*, 253.
[693] Al-Amīn, *al-Ghadīr*, 255-279.
[694] Al-Amīn, *al-Ghadīr*, 324.

such as Marwān, Ṭalḥa, ʿĀʾisha, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ are never discussed by Muʿāwiya or by other historians, such as Ibn Ḥajar, in general.[695] Where was Muʿāwiya while ʿUthmān was being killed? He discusses his lack of courage at the time when ʿUthmān needed his help. To al-Amīnī, if he was so concerned about his cousin, surely twenty years at the helm of governing Syria would have been enough to help quickly change what was at hand. This is why, for al-Amīnī, when historians stated that Muʿāwiya used his own personal reasoning and may have been wrong, he analyses what is meant by personal reasoning, or *ijtihād*, and what its conditions are.[696] Can anyone give his personal opinion, or does there have to be a particular course of training or action before a decision is undertaken? Furthermore, al-Amīnī asks, what knowledge does Muʿāwiya even hold of the Prophet Muḥammad's teachings for him to exercise judgement on proceedings?[697] Is this not the man who did not accept any statement unless it was from the time of the second caliph? Why the sudden end to narrations and their acceptance? Did the narrations in some cases contradict his actions or did he have his own men now narrating al-Amīnī questions?[698]

Quṭb

The publication of Sayyid Muḥammad Quṭb's major Islamic works in the 1940s marked a shift within himself from being in a state of *jāhilīyyah* to a person who was more Islamic and traditional in his outlook. Three works were published in the middle to late forties: *al-Taṣwīr al-fannī fī al-Qurʾān* (The Artistic Illustration in the Qurʾān), *Mashahid al-Qiyāmah fī al-Qurʾān*

[695] Al-Amīnī, *al-Ghadīr*, 423.
[696] Al-Amīnī, *al-Ghadīr*, 473.
[697] Al-Amīnī, *al-Ghadīr*, 481.
[698] Al-Amīnī, *al-Ghadīr*, 483.

(The Spectacles of the Last Day in the Qur□□n) and *al-□Adalah al-Ijtima□□yyah f□ al-Isl□m* (Social Justice in Islam).[699] Qu□b views the community of the Prophet as being the only true Muslim community. Although he believes that the moral and just community continued to exist under the leadership of the caliphs Ab□ Bakr and □Umar, he questions the position of the likes of Ab□ Sufy□n, □Uthm□n and Mu□□wiya and the period of rule of the Umayyads as a whole.

□Uthm□n's decision to give freedom of the governorship to different family members is analysed by Qu□b. Each family member was given freedom to rule as they pleased, thus ensuring they established their power until they were virtually impossible to control. Mu□□wiya in particular is discussed by Qu□b as a clear example:

> Even apart from money there were also governorships which □Uthm□n scattered profusely among his relatives. Among these was Mu□□wiya, whose power □Uthm□n expanded considerably, giving him control of Palestine and the district of Emesa; he granted to him the single control of four armies, and thus made it easier for Mu□□wiya later to aspire to royal power during the caliphate of □Al□, by which time he had acquired money and built up armies.[700]

Qu□b is extremely critical of the sources that depict Mu□□wiya as being of the earlier entourage of companions and a man of known piety and knowledge. Mu□□wiya's biography and subsequent credential are examined and he disagrees with the picture portrayed by some historians.

> The erroneous fable still persists that Mu□□wiya was a scribe who

[699] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*.
[700] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 190.

> wrote down the revelations of All□h's Messenger. The truth is that when Ab□ Sufy□n embraced Islam, he besought the Prophet to give Mu□□wiya some measure of position in the eyes of the Arabs; thus he would be compensated of being slow to embrace Islam and of being one of those who had no precedence in the new religion. So the Prophet used Mu□□wiya for writing letters and contracts and agreements. But none of the companions ever said that he wrote down any of the Prophet's revelations, as was asserted by Mu□□wiya's partisans after he had assumed the throne.[701]

Mu□□wiya's politics was not in the spirit of the religion of Islam as espoused by the Prophet and the first two caliphs. Qu□b does not deny that Mu□□wiya has a right to establish his own system but that this system must maintain the principles of justice and morality in the way it is constructed. The way a leader obtains authority has a major bearing on his period of rule and the perception of Islamic politics as a whole. To Qu□b, Mu□□wiya's behaviour is not fitting for a Muslim caliph:

> We cannot condemn Mu□□wiya for instituting a new system of political theory including the idea of hereditary succession, or for forcing the people to accept it. But we can condemn him strongly for suppressing all moral elements in his struggle with □Al□, and throughout the course of his reign thereafter; for this was the first time that any such suppression had taken place in the history of Islam. For in Islam, politics, like life in general, had always been the expression of those moral feelings that lie deep within life, and which are rooted in its very nature.[702]

To Qu□b, Mu□□wiya is the embodiment of the Arab king rather than the Mu□ammadan caliph. Qu□b continues to display displeasure at

[701] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 183.
[702] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 183.

the immoral politics of the Umayyads. Was their entrance into power legitimate and what legacy would this leave when a dynasty sought to obtain power in future Islamic dynasties? The civil war that was fought against ʿAlī was not one which was based on sincere motives. The banner of Uthman's blood-stained shirt was a smokescreen to fight a bloody civil war, which contributed to the killing of innocent people within the state. Furthermore, the property of the people who would later rule would be usurped as well as the natural rights of the people to choose who was best fit to rule them.

> ʿUthmān was sent to the mercy of his Lord, and he was succeeded by the Umayyad state on a defacto basis; this by virtue of the power by which the Umayyads had achieved in the Muslim world, particularly in Syria, and by virtue of the power of the rooted Umayyad principles which were so much at variance with those of Islam. These principles comprised the appropriation of booty and property and profits, a complete absence of any attempt at a spirit of brotherhood or liberty or mutual responsibility, and the encouragement of an onslaught on the spirit of religion itself within the Islamic community.[703]

To Quṭb, ʿAlī was politically the sharpest, but his sharpness was based on Islamic ideals and not ʿilm based on *jāhilīyyah* principles from the pre-Islamic days.

> ʿAlī did not treat himself like this because he was ignorant of all this. It was simply because he realised that a ruler is at once an object of suspicion and an example; he is suspected of squandering the public monies which lie in the power; and to governors and people alike he should be an example of purity and frugality. So ʿAlī modelled himself on the discipline of Abū Bakr

[703] Quṭb, *Social Justice in Islam*, 193.

> and ʿUmar, rather than on the indulgence of ʿUthmān.[704]

Quṭb's portrays a clear demarcation with ʿUthmān and Muʿāwiya from the line established by the Prophet, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. ʿAlī, he believes, reflected the return of these principles of discipline and justice'. It is this justice that lead people to show animosity towards ʿAlī.

> As was but natural, the place-seekers were dissatisfied with ʿAlī, those accustomed to pre-eminence were displeased by the regulations for complete equality, as were those accustomed to preferential treatment by the regulations for complete justice. Such betook themselves to the other camp where, among the Umayyads, they found their desires could be satisfied, and where they could trample on the elements of justice, right, and conscience, alike in life and in authority.[705]

Quṭb contrasts ʿAlī's sermon with that of Muʿāwiya after the truce:

> Men of Kūfah, do you think that I fought against you on account of prayers or taxes or pilgrimage? I knew that you said the prayers, that you paid the poor-tax, and that you performed the Pilgrimage. I fought you in order to have control and mastery over you, now Allāh has granted me that mastery, though you may not like it. Now therefore, all the money and the blood which I have had to expend in this war is still to be repaid, and all the promises which I made in the truce are under my feet here.[706]

Muʿāwiya's behaviour is a sign of the darkness that enveloped Islam according to Quṭb. A truce, treaty or covenant are all

[704] Quṭb, *Social Justice in Islam*, 195.
[705] Quṭb, *Social Justice in Islam*, 197.
[706] Quṭb, *Social Justice in Islam*, 203-204.

agreements binding on the people and must be upheld and not broken. This was the truce after he gained power which he now clearly dismisses, an offence which Qu□b describes as being 'notorious and shameful because he takes pride in it'.[707]

To Qu□b, concluding that Mu□□wiya triumphed over □Al□ is wrong. It was □Al□ who triumphed over Mu□□wiya. The principles of the Prophetic message required a man who was unswerving in his character and loyal to his principles, principles built on the word of revelation and the discipline of Ab□ Bakr and □Umar. Had □Al□ wished, he could have displayed apolitical cunningness of the pre-Islamic Arabian times that could have kept him in power, through bribery and deceit. Qu□b makes this clear by quoting □Al□:

> Mu□□wiya is not more astute than I; but he is prepared to be treacherous and faithless. Had it not been for my dislike of treachery, I could have been the most astute man alive.[708]

But to Qu□b, history would have then spoken of two Mu□□wiyas, and not □Al□ and Mu□□wiya.

> Those who see in Mu□□wiya sagacity and merit do not find these qualities in □Al□, and to these things they attribute the ultimate triumph of Mu□□wiya. Such an opinion errs in its estimation of the conditions, as well as in its understanding of □Al□ and of those tasks which confronted him. The first and the greatest task which □Al□ had to face was to restore the vitality to the duties of Islam and its true spirit to the faith, to take away the veil which had been thrown over the spirit by the Umayyads, through the age and the weakness of □Uthm□n; If □Al□

[707] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam,* 204.
[708] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 197.

> had copied Mu□□wiya in taking no account of any moral instinct, then he would have failed in his purpose, and there would have been no point in his tenure of the caliphate from the point of view of the life of this faith. And what profit could there have been in exchanging one Mu□□wiya for another?[709]

To Qu□b, Mu□□wiya without the barriers of □Uthm□n as caliph, would reveal his true colours and ensure that the very principles of the religion of Islam were to be dismantled.

> Whatever faith and gentleness and piety □Uthm□n had had, they had acted as a restraint on the Umayyads; but with the removal of this restraint and with the breaking down of this barrier, the Umayyads went straight back to their pre-Islamic and early Islamic heritage. So Mu□□wiya proceeded to promote the family loyalty which was part of his plan; the first example of it was □Amr b. al-□□□. The Umayyads were a family united by their desires, and their ambitions, but divided by their cupidity and their greed, they were without a trace of morals, religion, or conscience.[710]

The embodiment of the criminal act of allowing the Umayyads into power is best understood according to Qu□b in seeing how Mu□□wiya paved the way for Yaz□d to succeeed him. Where, Qu□b asks, is the voice of the electorate or at least a *sh□r□* such as that of Umar? Furthermore, Yaz□d's credentials are not exactly fitting for a just, moral and knowledgeable guide. With the emergence of Yaz□d, Islam was virtually in a state of ruin.

> This we may say: From Umayyad times all restrictions on the public treasure were removed, and it became a legitimate source of plunder for the kings, their courtiers, and their sycophants.

[709] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 197.
[710] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 197.

> The bases of Islamic justice were destroyed, and the treasure became the pre-requisite of the ruling class, a source of profit for their followers, and a source of income to their hangers on. The caliphate became a monarchy, and a tyrannical monarchy at that, as the Messenger once said that it would, in a sudden access of prophetic insight.[711]

Modern Academic Studies

Crone and Hinds seek to discuss the idea that the traditional picture of history is a product of the opinions and ideology of later scholars and their depiction of those who had assumed power before them. Under the first three caliphs religious and temporal power was combined, whereas under ʿAlī, the role of the caliph seemed to change. An argument is positioned that the caliph remained a political figure only, with the companions protecting the Prophet's legacy. The major focus in the monograph is on the idea of God's deputy in contrast to the Prophet's deputy - *Khalīfat Allāh* and *Khalīfat Rasūl Allāh*.[712] Up to the time of Umayyads, the title *Khalīfat Rasūl Allāh* had been given to the caliphs, with ʿUmar even asking to be called Commander of the Faithful.[713] However, the Umayyads changed the title, possibly, as discussed by Goldziher, 'to convey the unlimited power of the ruler'.[714] The Umayyads took this title seriously. *Amīn Allāh,* or 'trustee of God', is one of the titles they assumed after ʿUthmān; Furthermore, Ḥajjāj writes a letter to ʿAbd al-Mālik stating the opinion that the caliph is higher

[711] Quṭb, *Social Justice in Islam*, 198.
[712] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph*, 19.
[713] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph*, 20.
[714] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 61.

than the Prophets and the angels. Not only do they show how he expresses this same view to Mu□ariff b. al-Mugh□rah, he was also of the view that one should visit □Abd al-M□lik's grave ahead of the Prophets.[715] The main point that emerges is that the *khal□fa* and *ras□l* are seen as God's agent on earth, and Mu□□wiya is one of them. They first define the role of the caliph and the institution:

> First, the caliph or the caliphal institution are described as □refuge' or 'stronghold' *(□i□mah*), a word with Qur□□nic resonance (3:96, he who holds fast to God, *ya□ta□imu bill□h*, is guided to the straight path). The metaphor conveys that it was the caliphs who saved the believers from error in both a political and a religious sense, or as others put it, that the caliphs were the pillars of the religion.[716]

Furthermore, the caliph is seen as being God's rope on earth, stemming from the Qur□□nic concept in verse 3:98.[717] Mu□□wiya was therefore seen as being 'an Im□m and a firm rope for mankind', or according to his son Yaz□d, *□abl min □ibal All□h*.[718] He, like others after him, could even begin to formulate his own laws, as Crone and Hinds point out in his instructions regarding stolen property to his governor in Med□na.[719] The *khal□fah* was a form of salvation. Allegiance to him was allegiance to God. There was only one Im□m and therefore only one *ummah*:

> It is for this reason that what looks to us like a choice between political rivals was in fact a religious one in early Islam. To give allegiance to an Im□m was to affiliate oneself to a guide

[715] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 28.
[716] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 38.
[717] 'And hold fast to Godʿs rope together and do not scatter'.
[718] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 39.
[719] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 46.

> who might or might not be the true representative of God; it was to choose one's umma. The fact that ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya may well have had identical beliefs in no way means that contemporaries were faced with a purely political dilemma.[720]

Shaban seeks to discuss the Umayyad era and that of the four caliphs. He uses new material as well as older sources. His opening line in his chapter on *Muʿāwiya and the Second Civil War* once again sets out the view as to the man's political prowess:

> Muʿāwiya was a man of *ʿilm*. This word is both complex and comprehensive and is not easily translated, but it is the best if not the only way of describing Muʿāwiya's special ability as a leader. However extreme and intimidating the pressures were, as a man of *ʿilm* he kept absolute self-control and made decisive judgments.[721]

Shaban describes Muʿāwiya as taking 'decisions after long and judicious thought', a man who always looked quickly to 'offer reconciliation' treating enemies with 'an unassuming generosity and magnanimity which saved their dignity', a man characterized by being 'eminently pragmatic and political', such a leader, in his opinion, was definitely needed at the time.[722] Shaban regarded him as ʿāmīr al-Muʾminīn,[723] a title previously reserved for ʿUmar and ʿAlī, but then admits that Muʿāwiya avoided any 'claim to religious authority'.[724] His main claim about decentralization and autonomy highlights for him the ʿilm of Muʿāwiya:

---

[720] Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2, 41.
[721] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 79.
[722] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 79.
[723] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 79.
[724] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 80.

> His policy was to assert the central government's power only when feasible. When the tribesmen objected, Mu□□wiya gracefully surrendered. This respect for both the tribesmen's autonomy and for the power of central government required all the *f□nesse politique* and his extremely well chosen governors in the provinces.[725]

Hawting examines arguably one of the most important periods in Islamic as well as Arabian history. He looks at the shape which the Islamic faith had taken up to and including that period, as well as looking at a very important area, namely being whether the Umayyad caliphs viewed themselves as Mu□ammad's deputies or as God's representatives on earth. He is of the belief that the Umayyads regarded themselves as deputies of God rather than as successors to the Prophet.[726] This follows Crone and Hinds belief that the Umayyads had both secular and religious authority.[727] Lapidus differs in his analysis of their role. He states that:

> Though they headed the community, the religion and the state, the caliphs did not inherit Mu□ammads prophethood, nor were they a source of religious doctrine or law.[728]

Hawting begins with a chapter on the period of Umayyad history as well as its place in Islamic history. What Hawting does very well in examining a depiction of Mu□□wiya amongst other caliphs is that he presents the structure of government in-depth: the governors are discussed, the different tribes, Islamization/Arabization, the ban on pictorial images, their respective factions as well as the Maw□l□ are all brought

---

[725] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 80.
[726] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam,* 13.
[727] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph,* 6, 8-11.
[728] Ira M. Lapidus, 'The Separation of State and Religion in the Development of Early Islamic Society", *IJMES* 6 (1975), 368-369.

together coherently. The discussion likewise may at times be as brief as a paragraph without being tedious.

Hawting allows readers to join his interpreting adventure: ‘It seems best therefore to accept the above as a summary of what the Muslim tradition tells us and to leave open the question of its basis in fact’,[729] ‘The reports about it do not make sense’,[730] ‘The background to this is obscure’.[731] Hawting makes conditions clear, opening many angles for debate, not only on the position of the caliphs, but also on the revolutions of the time – ‘There has been room…for considerable controversy over the nature of what is often called “the ʿAbbāsid revolution”’, an expression which, if it has any validity, should be understood as reflecting…’[732]

Hawting, however, does stress that historians remain uncertain as to Muʿāwiya’s position, defining *ḥilm* within his discussion:

> In tradition, Muʿāwiya’s image is somewhat two-sided. On the one hand, he is regarded as a clever and successful ruler who got what he wanted by persuasion rather than force. The key concept here is that of *ḥilm*. This is a traditional Arab virtue signifying subtlety and cunning in the management of men and affairs and it is seen as a desideratum for the traditional Arab leader. Muʿāwiya is traditionally portrayed as one of the supreme exemplars of the virtue of *ḥilm*, using flattery and material inducements rather than force.[733]

[729] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam,* 24.
[730] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam,* 29.
[731] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam,* 82.
[732] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam,* 104.
[733] Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam,* 42.

The other side is that of his turning the caliphate into a kingship. Hawting stresses that barring one of the Umayyads, the rest are seen as kings. Hawting's appendix plays a crucial role in his concluding analysis. Titled 'Modern Developments in the Study of and Attitudes to Umayyad History', the author describes the literary approach to the source material. The question arises as to whether there is any possibility of reconstructing Umayyad history in greater depth.

In his book *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya in Early Arabic Tradition*, Petersen divides the corpus of traditions in two parts, the pro-Umayyad Syrian version of Ḥulayh b. Kaysān and Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī and the pro-ʿAlid version of al-Shaʿbī located in Kūfah. 'The history and historiography of the civil war are two completely different things'.[734] Petersen had already analysed the factual happenings in the power struggle between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya.[735] Petersen examines how historiography plays a major role in our understanding of the struggle between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya.

> Modern critical studies of history have enabled us to prove, point by point, that substantial parts of the immensely rich material handed down by Islamic chroniclers must be due to subsequent misrepresentations of facts for the purpose of serving passionate political partisanship. It is of particular significance that the historical as well as legal transmission - irrespective of both the interests and the means employed - very nearly unanimously condemn the Umayyad caliphate.[736]

Interestingly, Petersen begins his analysis of what he describes

[734] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya,* 12.
[735] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 157-196.
[736] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 157.

as the ‘ill will’ shown towards the Umayyads by indicating that this could have been due to their disregard of the claims of the Prophet’s family - represented by ʿAlī as well as the helpers and the immigrants. However, he quickly points the reader towards the fact that during the period of the first two caliphs, Umayyads were given major positions, with Yazīd and then his brother, Muʿāwiya, becoming governors of Syria.

> This arrangement would suggest that the Umayyads had special interests to safeguard in these areas, interests to which the caliph had felt obliged to submit.[737]

Indeed, in 637 Muʿāwiya becomes ʿUmar’s governor. This, to Petersen, is of the utmost importance. Syria was the economic centre of the Mediterranean, and the Umayyads, through their relations with the Syrian Arabs and Byzantines, were stronger than ever. ʿUthmān’s reign as caliph cements the position of the Umayyads. Nepotism is evident in the posts within the government, possibly proving to be his downfall:

> He did it especially by placing members of his family in key positions as governors of the provinces, a procedure that was destined to evoke the latent discord, and in which connection the general indignation against the Meccan aristocracy, the incarnation of *Jāhiliyyah*, has presumably played an important part.[738]

Furthermore, reference is given to those who may have had a major role to play in ʿUthmān’s downfall. Their names are indeed pivotal when examining the civil strife which emerges within Muʿāwiya’s rule, for amongst them ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ holds arguably

[737] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 159.
[738] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 160.

the highest of positions. Does Mu□□wiya employ a man who is one of the causes of what he later claims to avenge?

> Among the dissatisfied elements may be noted prominent people like the Prophets cousin, al-Zubayr, the wealthy □al□a□, □□□isha, and □Amr b. al-□□□. The latter had been removed by □Uthm□n from governorship in Egypt which happened to be one of the hotbeds of unrest.[739]

In witnessing □Uthm□n's death, Mu□□wiya decides to remain aloof from the proceedings. Petersen notes that not only does Mu□□wiya refrain from participating in the movement against □Uthm□n, but he also does not play a part in the first rebellion against □Al□, [740] who was, according to Petersen, made the scapegoat for the *fitnah,*[741] with many rising against him at the Battle of the Camel. Although victorious, the '□Uthm□n□yyah' movement spread from Egypt to Iraq and was now strengthened under Mu□□wiya in Syria.

In then examining the details of the relationship between □Al□ and Mu□□wiya, Petersen makes the point of highlighting that al-□abar□ chooses 'orthodox Iraqi tradition'.[742] This he places in contrast to al-Bal□dhur□, whose *Kit□b Ans□b al-Ashr□f* provides the Medinan stance on proceedings. Three versions are examined of the accounts of that period, □□lih b. Kays□n (d. 758), □Aww□nah (d. 764) and Ab□ Mikhnaf (d. 774), the first being Medinan, while the others were Kufic. The conclusion that emerges from the analysis of the three texts is that historiography plays a pivotal role in the narrations at hand:

---

[739] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 160.
[740] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 161.
[741] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 161.
[742] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 163.

> It becomes indeed very interesting to observe how the historiographic propaganda coincides chronologically with the formation of the earliest Medinese and Kufic legal doctrines, and does in its way quite correspond to the nature of Islamic historical writing.[743]

Mu□□wiya's role is very much questioned. Using terms such as 'power politics' and 'official politics',[744] Petersen seeks to build an image of a caliph with an aim somewhat different from what is normally suggested. Here, one may argue, the recurring theme of '*□ilm*' is presented once again, in covering any shortcomings. The Medinan sources are quiet in discussing his closeness with □Amr as Petersen points out:

> In this connection his relations with □Amr of considerable interest, a matter on which the Medinese sources are regrettably silent, and the Kufic ones, as already mentioned, obviously tendentious. □Amr's participation in the battle at □iff□n appears to be the first ascertainable event, which, again, must presuppose a previous agreement with Mu□□wiya concerning the Egyptian governorship.[745]

□Al□'s usage of Jar□r indicates a willingness for peace rather than bloodshed, in stark contrast to Mu□□wiya's listening to personalities exiled by the Prophet, such as al-Wal□d b. □Uqbah.[746] □Al□ is represented in Kufic circles as having a chivalrous and pure nature, in contrast once again to Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* which is defined as:

---

[743] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 173.
[744] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 178.
[745] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 178.
[746] *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1959), 179

> procrastinating opportunism could without marked strain be interpreted as lacking competence, cowardice, or guile and set off against ʿAlīʾs probity.[747]

This is also the basis of Khaled Keshk's doctoral dissertation on the depiction of Muʿāwiya in early sources. The depiction of Muʿāwiya, according to Keshk, very much depends on the period in which the accounts have taken place and the narrators of the respective events. His work includes an analysis of some diametrically opposed depictions, within three periods, pre-civil war, civil war and post-civil war. In the pre- civil war, Muʿāwiya's image is portrayed as that of an obedient governor. His loyalty, bravery and piety all emerge. What is the reasoning behind this? Keshk believes this is very much related to the fact that the historical tragedy of the first civil war has not yet affected Muʿāwiya's persona.[748]

Keshk then continues by looking at 'civil war Muʿāwiya' and discusses the fact that the negative images which emerge are due to parallels made between ʿAlīʾs struggle with Muʿāwiya and Muḥammad's struggle with Abū Sufyān.[749] Keskh then sheds light on two of the most important incidents in defining Muʿāwiya's image in Islamic history, the killing of Ḥujr b. ʿAdī al-Kindī and the appointment of Yazīd as heir apparent. Again the question is raised, is he the proverbial Arab shaykh or the despot? Keshk argues that this all depends on the way one views Ḥujr. Is Ḥujr a rebel against the cause or is he a renowned companion of the Prophet? Likewise when discussing Yazīd, he analyses the regional and political factors that led to the appointment.[750]

---

[747] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 118.
[748] Keshk, *The Depiction of Muʿāwiya,* 18.
[749] Keshk, *The Depiction of Muʿāwiya,* 53.
[750] Keshk, *The Depiction of Muʿāwiya,* 101.

Keshk's main point is that history and historiography are two different things.

> Madelung takes this argument, as he does with every negative comment about Mu□□wiya, with absolute truth. Although Madelung does seem to accept the story at face value, we believe he misses out some of its subtleties, or maybe he purposely avoids them.[751]

Again Keshk believes that without considering the sources and the environment of the time, Madelung is amongst historians who have reached the wrong conclusions:

> Mu□□wiya and his followers were easily stigmatized by the simple injection of Mu□□wiya's name among the confederates besieging Med□na at the Battle of the Trench. This association remained with Mu□□wiya and his followers through their subsequent struggle with □Al□ and his supporters. Indeed Mu□□wiya's character in these depictions was that of an evil, irreligious, cowardly usurper who was unworthy of the support of other Muslims, let alone the caliphate. This re-working of Mu□□wiya's image has been sufficiently effective that one modern scholar, namely Madelung, has accepted it as a true reflection of a historical figure, rather than the fictional story telling of the classical Muslim historians.[752]

Indeed, Madelung's work, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, is seen as neglecting this vital point. It is argued that no historian of the modern school has been as scathing in his attack as Madelung on the Umayyads in general and Mu□□wiya in particular:

---

[751] Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya,* 106.
[752] Keshk, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya,* 185.

> The cancer in the body of the caliphate which had nurtured and proved unable to excise because of his doting love for a corrupt and rapacious kin destroyed him. It was to continue to grow and to sweep away ʿUmar's caliphate of the Islamic meritocracy. ʿUthmān's successor, Muʿāwiya, turned it, as predicted by a well-known prophecy ascribed to Muḥammad, into traditional despotic kingship.[753]

This view of Muʿāwiya, in stark contrast to Humphreys and others, is further emphasized in discussing what they he viewed as *ʿilm*:

> Muʿāwiya had developed a taste for despotism of the Roman Byzantine type. While endowed with a natural instinct for power and domination, his judgment of human nature was, contrary to his reputation, limited and primitive. He had come to understand that in statecraft, whenever bribery or intimidation would not reduce an opponent, murder, open or secret, was the most convenient and effective means.[754]

Madelung then analyzes the role of cursing within Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm*. ʿAlī is portrayed by Muʿāwiya as a sworn enemy, in a manner which differs from the works of contemporary scholars, with the animosity displayed in public arenas:

> Particularly useful for Muʿāwiya's purposes was the public cursing of ʿAlī in Kūfah where, he hoped, it would bring out into the open the latent opposition to Umayyad rule, thus facilitating his measures of repression.[755]

Arab scholars view the appointment as questionable but in some ways necessary as clearly examined by Ḥusayn ʿAṭwān in his *Niẓām*

[753] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 140.
[754] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 197-8.
[755] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 335.

wilayāt al-ʿahd wa wirāthāt al-khilāfah fī al-ʿasr al-Umawī.[756] A second school of modern Arab scholars proposes, like Humphreys, Ibn Khaldun's theory of *ʿaṣabīyyah*, while a third discusses the fact that civil war would surely have happened had there been any other choice which had been made.[757] Interestingly, al-Najjār discusses the fact that Muʿāwiya could have appointed someone other than Yazīd, one who was more capable and who had a greater reputation within Umayyad circles.[758] Shaban points to the theory that a person like Marwān had spent too little time in Syria to be sure that he would receive the 'support of the *Jund*'. Furthermore, he stresses that Yazīd was of the Syrian tribe of Kalb and had lived amongst Syrians all his life with support thus being a guarantee.[759]

Conclusion

Both classical and modern scholars discuss the central issue of Muʿāwiya's period as governor and as caliph by using one genre of literature, namely historical. They seek to provide an understanding of the central arguments which emerge from analysis of this period. Each decision is critically assessed in relation to the attributes expected of the head of the early Islamic community. These decisions include his position in the dissension which affected ʿUthmān's caliphate, his expansion of the Islamic state and his battle with ʿAlī. *ʿilm* and *shujāʿa* are attributes which Muʿāwiya is credited with in seeking to portray him as the ideal leader. A third attribute which was seen as vital to the position of the caliph in early Islam, and which

[756] Ḥusayn ʿAwān in his *Niẓām wilayāt al-ʿahd wa wirāthāt al-khilāfah fī al-ʿasr al-Umawī*.(Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1991), 40-43.
[757] M. S. Taqqush, *Tārīkh al-dawla al-Umawīyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Nafāʾis, 1996).
[758] M. al-Najjar, *al-Dawla al-Umawīyya fi al-sharq* (Cairo, 1962), 44-45.
[759] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 90.

emerges in many of the classical as well as modern discussions, is that of *ʿilm*.

There is a two-sided presentation in traditions which discuss Muʿāwiya's leadership in historical sources. The first side views him as a man of *ʿilm*, a man who achieved what he wanted through persuasion rather than by using any force. This virtue is discussed by classic and modern historians in relation to Muʿāwiya's rule and reflects a subtlety in the management of the affairs of the Islamic polity. Muʿāwiya is seen as being a leader who does not need to resort to force, but only resorts to using his reputation and skills of persuasion. Flattery and material incentives are used to achieve success on the political front. However, there does not seem to be any examination of the development of this term in relation to the caliphs that preceded him and within the narratives of the Prophet Muḥammad. He is credited with a trait which, although viewed highly within Arabic circles, is not necessarily as highly viewed within the corpus of early Islamic tradition and discussions concerning leadership.

The other image of Muʿāwiya within classical and modern tradition is in stark contrast to this portrait. The caliphate is viewed as having turned into a kingship by Muʿāwiya. His palaces, his material inducements, his use of force to defeat opposition groups and his appointment of Yazīd, while still alive and in the possession of the caliphate are discussed in portraying the image of not just a king, but a despotic leader at the same time. Muʿāwiya was seen as a leader who displayed disregard of Islamic norms. It is Muʿāwiya who is to blame for the second civil war, an act of treachery in relation to the fact that he did not help ʿUthmān when ʿUthmān had needed his

help, but then later used his name to rise against ʿAlī. These works discuss the attributes of a leader within Islamic tradition. While they agree that he may have been a man of *ʿilm* in a definition usually associated with the Arab tribal shaykhs, they state that this attribute was not viewed as a condition for leadership in early Islam. *ʿIlm* and *shujāʿa,* however, are viewed as merits which they believe Muʿāwiya did not display and were very much required in the makeup of the caliph of the Islamic polity. Importantly, these studies have only focus on his depiction as caliph through historical sources and have not employed different genres of literature to provide a more broad and thorough analysis. The inter-textual approach will be used to examine his caliphate and the discussion of the attributes of *ʿilm, ʿIlm* and *shujāʿa* using different genres of literature.

Chapter 5

ʿilm

This chapter will seek to examine the first issue in Muʿāwiya's leadership, the attribute of *ʿilm*. Scholars have sought to define Muʿāwiya as a man of *ʿilm* and *dahāʾ*. These are the attributes which they use to describe his decisions as both governor and caliph of the Islamic polity. *ʿilm* and *dahāʾ*[761] were two attributes which Muʿāwiya was renowned for. Alongside Ziyād

[761] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 238; al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 206.

b. Abū Sufyān, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ and al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah al-Thaqafī,[762] he was known as one of the most astute personalities of the time. Known as Duhats, Qays b. Saʿd b. ʿAbāda al-Anṣārī has also been included amongst them in certain sources.[763] A number of examples of his self-control, cunningness and clemency can be examined. This conclusion concerning his leadership is normally reached by defining *ʿilm* and *dahāʾ* in a historical rather than literal context. Shaban, as an example, defines Muʿāwiya as a man of *ʿilm* through historical analysis by stating:

> As a man of *ʿilm* kept absolute self-control and made decisive judgements. He took decisions after long and judicious thought, and whenever possible rejected a show of power as a solution to his problems. He looked squarely at a problem to see what forces were at work so that through the subtle readjustment of these forces, he could reach an ingenious compromise.[764]

ʿilm has been defined alongside the word *ʿilm* and is linked to the concept of a type of knowledge.[765] Goldziher, in line with this definition, discussed the difference between a *ʿalīm* and a *jāhil*, stating that the *ʿalīm* is one who is civilised while the *jāhil* is to be viewed as a barbarian.[766] This was also somewhat in line with the view of Lammens.[767]

It is vital that the literal development of the term is understood, as this will shed light on the evolution of the usage of the term which is used to describe people both in

[762] Ibn Hajar, *al-Iṣābah*, vol. 3, 389.
[763] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 8.
[764] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 79.
[765] *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, vol. 3, 390.
[766] *Encyclopaedia of Islam,* 2nd edition, vol. 3, 391.
[767] Henri Lammens, *Etudies sur le regne du Calife Omiyade Mo'awiya I* (Leipzig, 1908), 108.

Islamic and pre-Islamic Arabia. What emerges is the fact that Mu□□wiya is credited with an attribute that had relatively ceased to exist in light of its original definition, and was largely overshadowed by innovative Qur□□nic concepts in the period of the preceding caliphs. In examining his government structure, there is now doubt that certain aspects of his policies within the state reflected upon his *□ilm*, such as his centralizing of power. However, in light of the definition of *□ilm* in pre-Islamic Arabian circles, a definition that was known to many, his despotic stance with □ujr b. □Ad□, the central theme of this analysis, leads one to conclude that this attribute has been easily awarded, as his behavior primarily opposed the archetypal Arab man of *□ilm*. This chapter will first consider what *□ilm* in this period was and then examine the *□ilm* of Mu□□wiya.

Evolution of the Concept of *□ilm*

□ilm (حلم) is a state defined as the balancing of the intellect and natural desires and remaining focused by keeping the emotions and logic controlled and avoiding extreme emotions such as anger. A person who has such characteristics is said to be *□al□m* (حليم).[768] In order to understand the characteristic of *□ilm*, one has to understand its usage in pre-Islamic Arabian circles. *□ilm* was viewed as being a characteristic that primarily opposed *jahl*. The latter term was defined as the behavior pattern of a:

> hot-blooded impetuous man, who tends to lose his self-control on the slightest provocation, and consequently to act wrecklessly, driven by an uncontrollable blind passion, without reflecting on

[768] □asan Mu□ammad al-Raghib al-Isfah□ni, *Kit□b al-mufrad□t f□ ghar□b al-Qur'□n* (Beirut: D□r al-ma□rifah, n.d.), 129.

> the disastrous consequence this behavior might lead to. It is the behavior pattern peculiar to a man of an extremely touchy and passionate nature, who has no control of his own feelings and emotions, and who therefore, easily surrenders himself to the dictates of violent passions, losing the sense of what is right and what is wrong.[769]

The *ḥalīm* was a person renowned for his:

> calmness, balanced mind, self-control and steadiness of judgement. *ḥalīm* is a man who knows how to smother his feelings, to overcome his own blind passions and to remain tranquil and undisturbed whatever happens to him, however much he may be provoked.[770]

ʿAmr b. Aḥar al-Bāhilī describes the contrast between *jahl* and *ʿilm* through metaphors in his famous verse, where he states that:

> Many of the large black cooking pots which our maid servants take good care of, once their belly (the content of the pots) becomes *jāhil* (boils up), it will never become *ḥalīm* (calm down).[771]

Izutsu, when commenting on the characteristics of *ḥalīm* and *ʿilm* emphasizes that they are not passive but are instead full of energy and exist within the nature of every human being:

> I must add one important remark regarding the meaning structure of *ḥalīm* and *ʿilm*. The explanation I have just given may convey that *ʿilm* were a passive quality, something that would remind one

[769] T. Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran: Semantics of the Qur'ānic Weltanschauung* (Tokyo: The Keio Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies, 1964), 205.
[770] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 205.
[771] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 206.

> of the natural meekness of a lamb. On the contrary, it is a positive and active power of the soul that is strong enough to curb her own impetuosity that may drive the man headlong to folly, and calm it down to patience and forebearance. It is a sign of power and the superiority of the mind. There can be no *ḥilm* when there is no power. It is essentially the quality of a man who governs and dominates others, and not of those who are governed and dominated. A naturally weak and powerless person is never called *ḥalīm*, however much he calms down his anger when insulted, he is 'weak' simply. *ḥalīm* is a man who possesses power, power to go to all kinds of violence when provoked and yet possesses at the same time, the power to restrain himself from doing violence.[773]

This ability to control and harness moments of anger while choosing instead to forgive can be seen in the poetry of Salīm b. Wābiṣah, where he states that 'to take the attitude of humility consciously is a kind of *ḥilm*, and in fact *ḥilm* based on power (and not coming from '*ajz,* or natural weakness) is a virtue characteristic of the nobleness of the soul'.[774]

The *ḥalīm* is one who is forgiving to his enemy although he has the power to defeat him and strike him back. His position is superior to that of his enemy, yet he restrains his ego and is calm in every situation. Hence, God is known as *ḥalīm* in Islam. He is forgiving of the sins of his creation with gentleness, 'not a simple gentleness, it is a gentleness based on power, forbearance based on calm wisdom'. [775]

The outward expression of *ḥilm* is therefore of the utmost

[773] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 207.
[774] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 208.
[775] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 208.

importance. *Waqqūr al-ʿilm* refers to the direction given to the expression of a judgement made by a *ʿalīm*, known as the grave and dignified bearing.[776] One of the renowned poets of the Umayyad period, Khalaf b. Khalīfah describes this concept by stating that:

> all of them show a remarkable level of *ʿilm* so much so that even a small boy among them looks as if he were a man of mature age because of his natural dignity.[777]

At times, it would be difficult to separate an expression of dignity from arrogance or even possible inner weakness that was being concealed. Some were powerful and therefore able to be gentle, others smiled only because their weak position meant they were forced to be thus. The pre-Islamic poet Qays b. Zuhayr describes how a real *ʿalīm* could at times be mistaken as the weak and powerless one, when he in reality was the more forgiving with tremendous power at his disposal:

> I think that it is my apparent *ʿilm* that has induced my tribesmen to do all kinds of wrong and injustice to me, but even a *ʿalīm* man may sometimes be forced to lose his composure and give a free reign to his ebuillient anger.[778]

In a sense one may argue that the Meccans saw the God of Muhammad as weak for not sending any promised punishment upon them as they had been warned. This was their miscalculation of Divine *ʿilm*.

Furthermore, this characteristic of *ʿilm* was viewed as a

[776] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 208.
[777] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 208.
[778] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 209.

necessity for any head of government or, indeed, tribal affairs. A contemporary of the Prophet, Ma□bad b. □Alqamah, describes this when stating that, 'Our hands act in a *j□hil* way, yes, but our head remains calm and *□al□m*'. The head would require *□ilm* for he was to ensure that decisions were taken which would demonstrate intellect rather than ignorance, calmness rather than haste. The head of the tribe would always have this indispensable quality.

Izutsu describes how:

> *□ilm* is also capable of being developed in another direction, that is the direction of administrative skill and political wisdom, a remarkable show of tact and statesmanship, based on a perfect control of one's feelings, in dealing with other people and particularly, in governing and ruling other people.[779]

As the poet al-Marr□r b. Sa□□d states:

> If you ever want to rule people as their chief, then rule them not with rashness and abusing, rule them with *□ilm*. For indeed *□ilm* produces a better result than *jahl* - you must keep it well in mind - except in the event of your being treated unjustly with excessive hatred and enmity.[780]

Watt recognizes the importance of *□ilm* in the makeup of Arabian political society.[781] The Arabian hierarchy had developed a technique to rule their people and devised a type of political wisdom which would ensure that they would be able to build their mercantile enterprises. The Prophet was also seen as a man of

[779] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 211.
[780] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 212.
[781] W. Montgomery Watt, *Mu□ammad at Mecca* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953), 10-11.

ʿilm, helping him build and nurture a religious community. He used his intellect to develop the intellects of those who surrounded him. The people of *ʿilm* were to be revered to the extent that they were referred to Qurʾānically as the lights of the community and the beacons of intellect, primarily opposing those in ignorance:

> Is it that their faculties of understanding (*aḥlām*) urge them to this, or are they but a people transgressing beyond bounds?[782]

The mentioning of *ʿilm* in reference to intellectual reasoning which was then associated with calmness and boldness can be seen in the poetry of Ḥasan b. Thābit when he states that:

> Oh Banū ʿUrith! Do your intellects (*aḥlām*) prevent you from attacking me?
>
> But on reflection I must admit that this is demanding too much of you for you are all hollow with nothing inside, giants with tiny brains.
>
> There is nothing wrong in people's being tall and big, but the combination of a body as a mule and an intellect (*aḥlām*) as small as that of little birds is too much![783]

Qurʾānically, however, and when examining the period of the first four caliphs, the characteristic of *ʿilm* no longer occupies a prominent position. It is used only with reference to God himself. It seems that this attribute which figured in so much of the pre-Islamic poetry ceased to exist as a defining characteristic with the onset of Islamic thought especially in

[782] Qur'ān 52:32.
[783] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 215.

the early period. Izutsu contended that Islam acted as an umbrella to protect the spirit of *ʿilm*, if not necessarily making any direct reference:

> It is still palpably there, not as a definite concept, but diffused throughout the Koran. In a certain sense, the Koran as a whole is dominated by the very spirit of *ʿilm*. The constant exhortation to kindness (*iḥsān*) in human relations, the emphasis laid on justice (*ʿadl*), the forbidding of wrong violence (*ẓulm*), the bidding of abstinence and control of passions, the criticism of groundless pride and arrogance - all are concrete manifestations of the spirit of *ʿilm*.[784]

There seems to be a radical shift in the interpretation of *ʿilm*. A caliph who was *ʿalīm* was a real believer:

> who should go far beyond the degree of *ʿilm* in the direction of humbleness and humility before God. All consciousness of self-sufficiency and power should be abandoned.[785]

To Izutsu, *ʿilm* was in a sense 'pre-Islamic and a pre-religious form of Islam'. Islam drew new lines and covered new boundaries in redefining what was a vast field covered by the concept, what Izutsu describes as a 'new articulation'.[786] *ʿilm,* however, was not considered to be a characteristic which was required of the leader of the Islamic polity and was re-defined from its pre-Islamic use to reflect Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* as leader.

This chapter will seek to examine Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* in relation to the way he managed the affairs of the state both internally and

[784] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 216.
[785] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 218.
[786] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 219.

externally. His reaction and responses to opposition and raised grievances will allow us to shed light on the definition of *ʿilm* and the nature of its applicability to Muʿāwiya's leadership.

Centralising Power

Amongst the examples of Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* is the way in which he centralized power. Damascus became the capital of the centralised empire. Medīna had been replaced as the centre of economic and political movements and decisions. Muʿāwiya was revered by the Syrians and this acted as a source of encouragement for him. Syrians, and in particular, tribal chiefs, were vital in the continuation of his government, their support was a necessity. The Syrians had been loyal to Muʿāwiya in the years of struggle with ʿAlī. They defended him and were his bedrock of support. They would safely live in their districts and did not have to struggle to move to other provinces. However, in the summer or winter, they would be given the task of raiding Byzantine territory which would result in them receiving a large amount of booty.[787]

Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* can be explored in light of the balance that he maintained between the two tribal groups known as the Yemenites and the Qaysites in Syria.[788] These were people with an important historical right in the land. Many immigrants had left Yemen and gone to Syria due to economic problems and the occurrance of natural disasters[789] before Islam had come to Arabia. These Arab tribes eventually decided to settle in Syria. Ghassān settled in

[787] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 81.
[788] See Patricia Crone, "Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad Period Political
Parties?", 1–57.
[789] Qurʾān 34:14-15.

Damascus and □□r□n. The Sak□n of Kinda were in □ims, the Tan□kh settled in the northern part of the Syrian desert settled, while a group called the Ball□, who were from Qull□, settled in the southern part of the Syrian desert. Also from Qud□□ah were the Kalb tribe who were in Palestine and Jordan.[790] The Ban□ Ghass□n,[791] due to their Christian background, fought the Arabs alongside the Byzantines in the early years of the Arab conquest, alongside other tribal groups.[792] Yemenites and Qaysites had been major supporters of Ab□ Bakr in the conquering armies, and an examination of the make-up of □Umar's army reveals that Yemen's decision to opt for Iraq ahead of Syria was because of their feeling for the land of their forefathers.[793]

The question arises as to what made Mu□□wiya favour the Yemenites in this way.
One school of thought suggests that he sought to prepare for a war with □Al□ and secure his internal position in Syria.[794]

It is true that without a doubt, both tribes occupied important positions at □iff□n.[795] A second school of thought suggests that it was his *□ilm* which led him to conclude that a balance had to be maintained between the two respective groups. Therefore key government seats were to be shared. Qaysite men of standing were given important positions such as Yaz□d b. □urr al-□Abs□ and al-□a□□k b. Qays al-Fihr□.
A narration in *Kit□b al-Agh□ni*, '*Wa K□na L□ Yafri□u Ill□ lil*

[790] Al-Mas□□d□, *Mur□j*, vol. 3, 215-217; al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 2347; al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□*, 59.
[791] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□*, 135.
[792] See also Bakhit and Schick, eds., *The History of the Bil□d al-Sh□m.*
[793] al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 2187-2188.
[794] A. A. Dixon, *The Umayyad Caliphate 65-86/684-705: A Political Study* (London: Luzac, 1971), 86.
[795] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 3, 246.

Yamān'[796] suggests that stipends were allotted to the Yemenite tribes and this would threaten the Qays with expulsion. Shaban rejects this idea and relates it instead to immigration – 'Muāwiya used his authority to limit the immigration to tribesmen related to clans in Syria'.

Shaban's conclusion is strengthened by the fact that regular stipends were shared with Syrian and Egyptian tribesmen in the reign of ʿAbdul-Mālik b. Marwān.[797]

Government Structure

As caliph, Muāwiya would choose men who were suited to their posts. Some of these appointments would be men from his own clan, while others would be of capable men from famous clans. However, he would exercise caution in making appointments or in installing anyone into a higher position of authority. They would, as an example, be nominated to head a small city like al-Ṭāʾif, then if they were deemed capable, they were given governorship of Mecca or Medīna.[798] The Thaqīf were in a strong position in al-Ṭāʾif. If this area could be controlled, then the rest of Ḥijaz would not be difficult to control either. He displayed political finesse in employing helpers of the Prophet Muhammad and his companions. As an example, al-Nuʿmān b. Bashīr al-Anṣārī was nominated as governor of Ḥims and later Kūfah.[799]

His nominations ensured the administration of the government would run smoothly. The governor of the province would have capable men alongside him collect the land tax. Qays b. al-

[796] Al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, vol. 18, 69.
[797] Al-Kindī, *al-Wulāt wa al-Qudāt*, 45, 49, 50.
[798] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 167.
[799] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 216.

Haytham al-Sulam□ was not only governor but would also act as an advisor for the fiscal affairs of Khur□s□n for the governor Ibn □□m□r. □Abdull□h b. Kh□zim al-Sulam□[800] would eventually replace Qays, and he in turn nominated Aslam b. Zur□ah al-Kil□b□ to work with □Ubaydull□h b. Ziy□d, governor of Khur□s□n, in fiscal affairs. This was in the year 54/674.[801] □Ubaydull□h eventually became governor of Ba□ra, and Mu□□wiya ensured a smooth transition with Aslam remaining at the helm of Khur□s□n until 56/676 until he was replaced by Sa□□d b. □Uthm□n b. □Aff□n. Is□□q b. □al□a's death meant that he would act as governor as well as fiscal adviser.[802]

Judges were employed to instill justice in the state. These were either companions of the Prophet or adherents. In K□fah he instilled the renowned Shuray□ b. al-□□rith al-Kind□.[803] □Uwaymir b. Qays al-Khazraj□ al-An□□r□, otherwise known as Ab□ al-Dard□, was chief judge of Damascus. When he died, he was replaced by Fa□□la b. □Ubayd al-An□□r□, al-Nu□m□n b. Bash□r al-An□□r□, and finally, Bil□l b. Ab□ al-Dard□ al-An□□r□.[804] In Ba□ra, he installed □Imr□n b. al-□usayn al-Khuza□□, □A□im b. Fa□□la and □Umayr b. Yathrib□ al-□abb□. Sulaym b. □Itr al-Terab□t held office for twenty years in Egypt.[805]

Furthermore, his kinsmen would be separated to ensure that they would not be able to form a coalition against him. A famous incident of his *□ilm* may be seen in the ordering of the destruction of the house of Sa□□d b. al-□□□ b. □Umayyah. Marw□n,

[800] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 65.
[801] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 168-9.
[802] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 178-9.
[803] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 81-5, 156-57.
[804] Muḥammad b. □Al□ Ibn □□l□n, *Quḍ□t Dimashq: al-thaghr al-bass□m f□ dhikr man wuliyya qaḍ□□ al-Sh□m,* ed. S. Munajjid (Damascus, 1956), 1-4; Ibn Hajar, *al-I□□bah*, vol. 4, 46-206.
[805] Al-Kind□, *al-Wul□t wa Kit□b al-Qud□t*, 303.

then governor of Medīna, received a letter with orders to destroy the house of Saʿīd. Marwān refused. Upon becoming governor, Saʿīd was ordered to destroy the house of Marwān. He would have complied with the order were it not for Marwān's display of the previous letter which had been given to him. They viewed this as a divide and rule policy, writing letters to Muʿāwiya and expressing their feeling to him.[806]

Tolerance of Muslims

Furthermore, *ʿilm* can be seen in his treatment of non-Muslims who were living under Muʿāwiya's rule, would receive equal privileges, and would be very much tolerated in the affairs of Islamic state.

Rebellions Opposing Muʿāwiya

Muʿāwiya had cleverly chosen al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah al-Thaqafī, a man of experience, as governor of Kūfah.[810] Al-Mughīrah could now help control any emerging political rivals for Muʿāwiya in Kūfah and indeed dissenters. As soon as he came into power, al-Mughīrah would have to end the revolt of Muʿayn b. ʿAbdullāh al-Muʿāribī and ensured that he was executed. Abū Laylā, ally of Banū al-Ḥārith b. Kaʿb was also killed. He had shouted, '*Taḥkīm*!' (arbitration), in the mosque and wanted to revolt in Kūfah. Maʿqil b. Qays al-Riyāḥī was appointed by al-Mughīrah to kill him in the Sawād.

Muʿāwiya had appointed al-Mughīrah in Kūfah and ʿAbdullāh b.

[806] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 25; al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 164-5.
[810] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 139-40.

□□m□r in Ba□ra. □Abdull□h had to face the Khaw□rij but was seemingly lenient with them. □Ib□dah b. Qur□ al-Layth□, known as a companion of Mu□ammad, was killed by a group of the Khaw□rij who had been led by Sahm b. Gh□lib al-Hujaym□. They killed him as well as his wife and son. □Abdull□h caught them, but did not kill them, and ensured that they were to be granted amnesty. He therefore went against an order from Mu□□wiya to execute them.[811] Mu□□wiya dismissed him because:

> he had some difficulties in his dealings with the the tribesmen in Ba□ra itself. This was because large numbers of new immigrants coming into Ba□ra had caused some tension between the different tribal groups. Mu□□wiya, who was alarmed by the situation, removed Ibn □□m□r in 44/664, replacing him with the redoubtable Ziy□d ibn Abih□.[812]

These two appointments were signs of the *□ilm* of Mu□□wiya. He knew who to appoint and when to replace them and with whom to replace them. Al-Mugh□rah was protecting K□fah for him and Ziy□d was now ensuring the smooth running of affairs in Ba□ra. Al-Mugh□rah was constantly aware of the plans of the Khaw□rij. Men such as Mu□adh b. Juwayn al-□a'□, al-Mustawrid b. □Ullafa al-Taym□ and □ayy□n b. Dhabyan al-Sulam□ were seeking to make a breakthrough in K□fah, especially □ayy□n, who had been in al-Rayy since 38/658. The meetings were held in the house of □ayy□n and were attended by twenty of the Khaw□rij. Qab□□a b. al-D□m□n was appointed to break the meeting, capture and imprison the leaders in the prisons of K□fah. These people had felt oppressed and at the same time felt Islamic law was not being implemeneted. However, al-Mustawrid escaped and al-Mugh□rah met each and every tribal leader to ensure that they kept an eye out

[811] Ibn al-Ath□r, vol. 3, 417-418.
[812] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 85-86.

for the rebels, and if they did not, or if a rebel was from their tribe, then the whole tribe would be imprisoned. This form of governance had not been witnessed in the reigns of any of the first caliphs.[813]

Furthermore, Mughīrah would ensure that any of the enemies of the central government would fight each other. Qabīṣa b. al-Dimān was ordered to ensure three thousand of the Shīʿīs of Kūfah would be sent under Maʿqil b. Qays al-Riyāḥī, a Shīʿī, to fight al-Mustawrid. Both died at al-Madhār, a Khārijite and a Shīʿī fighting each other with al-Mughīrah instigating the war. Indeed, anyone whose loyalty was in question would not be given any sanctuary, including Shabīb b. Bajra al-Ashjaʿī who had fought against ʿAlī at al-Nahrawān was killed by Khālid b. ʿUrfuṭa in ʿUnquf near Kūfah.[814]

Ziyād b. Abīhi made a unanimous announcement when appointed as the governor (45/664) of Baṣra which embodied the message of the government.

> I swear I will never be remiss in punishing the client for the Sire, the father for the son, the healthy for the sick, the staying for the fugitive, the obedient for the unruly, until the man on meeting will say, 'Save yourself Saʿd for Saʿīd has perished'.[815]

Those who were pardoned or given amnesty would no longer receive such treatment under Ziyād. As an example, Sahm was killed and Ziyād b. Mālik al-Bāhilī was to be placed under house arrest in Baṣra under the watchful eye of Muslim b. ʿAmr al-Bāhilī. On the

[813] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 32-33.
[814] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 141.
[815] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 74.

night that Ziyād asked to see Ziyād b. Mālik he was not there. This led to his execution and his body was not even given a burial but thrown towards a resident tribe.[816] Ziyād was ruthless but the act of throwing a body with no burial was unprecedented.[817] Furthermore, when ʿAbbad b. Ḥusayn al-Ḥabaṭī led a revolt in Baṣra, he was mercilessly caught and executed by Bishr b. ʿUtbah al-Tamīmī under the orders of Ziyād. The latter would eventually take charge of both Kūfah and Baṣra when al-Mughīrah died in 50/670. One governor would administer both districts for the first time. He would ensure that he spent six months in Baṣra and six months in Kūfah.

His strength as governor would be revealed through the revolts that would be led when he was not present. An increase in revolts began because of his strictness with his fiscal policies and the purging of records which included the names of the deceased of the Khawārij. Corruption would then be limited and people would not abuse the system.[818] When he left Baṣra, he would announce Samar b. Jundab al-Fazārī as his successor and some Khawārij would seek to revolt including the likes of Qurayb b. Murra al-Azdī and Zaḥḥāf b. Zaʾr al-Ḥabaṭī. They had the audacity to march through the streets and kill. When Ziyād returned he unleashed a warning that if the people of Baṣra did not cooperate with him then they would feel the force of his administration and rule. Their annual stipends would also be cut off.[819] This announcement led to the heads of the tribes of ʿAlī and Rāsib to besiege the Banū Yashkur and kill Qurayb and his companions. If your tribe was made up of a Kharijite, people

[816] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 148-49.
[817] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 149.
[818] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 87.
[819] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 150-152.

would ensure that the person would be taken to Ziyād.[820]

Ziyād was equally ruthless with the women of the community. In an unprecedented move, he declared that even the women of the Khawārij would be killed if they were known to be plotting against the state. Questions are raised about Muʿāwiya's silence on this issue as this was not known to be a practice of Prophet Muḥammad. Women were to be hung naked if they were following the ideologies of Qurayb and Zaʿf. Jārīyah, a women of the Khārijites decided that she had to speak out against Ziyād and his policies. She was to be executed and hung as a message to all Baṣran women who supported the Khawārij. The caliph was silent when advice and guidance was necessary to stop the ruthless Ziyād.[821] By the end of his rule, none of the Khārijites could rebel against him, male or female. Hence one may argue this was the reason Muʿāwiya was silent. Ziyād's message was continued by his son ʿUbaydullāh, who would cut off the feet of ʿUrwah b. ʿAdīyah b. Ḥandhala al-Tamīmī when he had the bravery to criticise his father's policies. He also had to foil the revolt of Ṣawwaf b. Ghallāq. When ʿUrwah's brother Abū Bilāl sought to revolt in Darabjerd, he was killed by Ibn Ziyād's commander ʿAbbād b. ʿAlqama b. ʿAmr al-Mazinī al-Tamīmī in 61/681.[822]

Ḥujr b. ʿAdī

The main question which surrounds Muʿāwiya's leadership and his *ʿilm* in particular is the incident of the killing of Ḥujr b. ʿAdī. Arab historians are of the belief that Muʿāwiya was at

[820] Al-Mubarrad, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 245.
[821] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 152-153.
[822] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 159.

fault for killing Ḥujr, and that Ḥujr and his supporters were innocent.[823] Some scholars believe that Ḥujr was oppressed by Ziyād and that Ziyād helped Muʿāwiya in making his decision to execute Ḥujr.[824] Shaban viewed the act as despotic. Wellhausen and Hawting portray Muʿāwiya as having had little choice because of the schism that existed between Ḥujr and Ziyād and therefore he was left to execute Ḥujr and forgive the latter.[825] Maḥmood Ibrāhīm portrays execution as the only way to end a class struggle in a nascent Islamic polity. He concludes that Ḥujr was a threat to Muʿāwiya's economic interests and therefore had to be executed, which is in line with Shaban's 'despot' conclusion. The taking of the Ḥawafī land was the first step:

> With its income taken away from them, this faction of the New Segment were reduced further despite their objections which ended in the execution of Ḥujr ibn ʿAdī and some of his supporters, the first political execution in Islam.[826]

Interesting to note that Hodgson contended that *ʿilm* was represented by executing those who were dividing the state. In executing Ḥujr, Hodgson views Muʿāwiya as an Arab shaykh rather than an autocrat and that the unity of the Muslim community at the time could only be maintained by executing those who were deemed as threats, irrespective of their backgrounds or past

---

[823] Muḥammad al-Sayyid al-Wakīl, *al-Umawīyun bayna al-sharq wal-gharb: dirāsah waṣfīyah wa-taḥlīlīyah lil-dawlah al-Umawīyah* (Damascus: Dār al-Qalam, 1995), 87-90; al-Najjār, *al-Dawla al-Umawīyah fi-l-sharq*, 80.
[824] Ibrāhīm Aḥmad al-ʿAdawī, *al-Dawla al-Umawīyah* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Shabāb, 1987-88), 87; Muḥammad Māhir Hamda, *Dirāsa wathāʾiqīyya li-l-Tārīkh al-Islāmī wa-maṣādirihī; min ʿahd banī umayyah ḥata al-fatḥ al-ʿUthmānī li-Sūriyah wa-Miṣr 40-922 AH /661-1516 CE* (Beirut: Muʾassassat al Risāla, 1988), 38-39.
[825] J. Wellhausen, *The Religio-Political Factions of Early Islam*, ed. R.C. Ostle, trans. R.C. Ostle and S.M. Waltzer (Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing, 1975).
[826] Maḥmood Ibrāhīm, *The Social and Economic Background of the Umayyad Caliphate* (University of California, Los Angeles, Ph.d. dissertation, 1981), 370-1.

service to the religion. Khaled Keshk concludes that the core of the Ḥujr incident is true, but that historians sought to add their own explanations within the narrative. He examines Ḥujr as a dissident and as a martyr, then analyses the different versions which portray his struggles with Muʿāwiya. Keshk seeks to portray that the inclusion of Khubayb b. ʿAdī in Baʿran sources highlights how history repeats itself, as Abū Sufyān was a witness to Khubayb's death and his son was a witness to Ḥujr's.[827] Such incidents would be included in narratives of other clashes to add weight to the image of the martyr, as discussed by Waldman and al-Qāḍī.[828]

The partisans of ʿAlī revolted against Muʿāwiya and his central government. They had paid allegiance to al-Ḥasan, son of ʿAlī and grandson of Muḥammad, soon after the Battle of Ṣiffīn and the murder of ʿAlī. They viewed al-Ḥasan as the legitimate successor to ʿAlī. Muʿāwiya did not believe that al-Ḥasan had the capability of leading the community and dismissed him, by stating:

> I admit that your blood relationship gives you a clear title to the office. If I knew that you were more capable than I in keeping the people under discipline, more considerate of this Ummah, a better statesman, more effective in collecting the revenues, and a greater deterrent against the enemy, I would certainly swear allegiance to you. But I have had long enough in this position and I have much more experience in its duties than you have.[829]

---

[827] K. Keshk, "The Historiography of an Execution: The Killing of Ḥujr ibn ʿAdi", *Journal of Islamic Studies* 19, 1 (January 2008), 1-35.
[828] M. R. Walmand, *Toward a Theory of Historical Narrative* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1980); Wadīd al-Qāḍī, *Bishr ibn Kubar al-Balawī*; *Namūdhaj min al-nathr al-fannī al-mubakkir fī al-Yaman* (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islamī, 1985).
[829] Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī, *Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyyīn*, ed. Aḥmed Saqr (Cairo,

Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* is decisive in not making any statements in relation to the knowledge required for the post of caliph of the *shar□□ah*, but to focus solely on administrative duties and experience. Al-□asan promptly responded through seeking to win the confidence of the K□fans, asking them to be at peace with whoever he is at peace with and at war with whoever he is at war with. The K□fans treated his words with suspicion and he eventually abdicated his position.

Mu□□wiya did not face the animosity from the partisans of □Al□ as he had faced from the Khaw□rij. In the first ten years of his rule, there was relative peace between the two factions. □Abdull□h b. Am□r, the governor of Ba□ra, and al-Mugh□rah b. Shu□bah, would employ prominent Sh□□□ such as Shar□k b. al-A□war al-□□rith□ to fight the Khaw□rij. However, where Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* is to be questioned is in making the cursing of □Al□ on the pulpits permissible. This was an unprecedented act in Islamic history and would result in protests from the followers of □Al□. His followers would constantly display their loyalty towards their leader by narrating his merits. Sa□sa□ah b. Sahw□n al-□Abd□ was once informed by al-Mugh□rah when hearing that he would narrate the merits of □Al□ publically:

> I warn you to stop doing so, and to remember that you will not say a thing in praise of □Al□ which I do not know. If you want to do so, you can do it among your kinsmen in your houses and in secret but in the mosque I shall not permit it and the Caliph himself will not tolerate this or forgive me for this if I allow you to do it.[830]

1949; 2nd edition, Tehran, 1970), 58.
[830] Al-□abar□ (citing Ab□ Mikhn□f), *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 38.

The statement that the merits of ʿAlī would not be tolerated in the mosque is suprising, however, by this time, the cursing of ʿAlī had become an institution, and which was approved by the caliph and the governor.

The Shīʿa of ʿAlī would not accept what they viewed as an act of injustice against the tenets of Islam. ʿAlī was a caliph, the son-in law of Prophet Muḥammad and a noble man of great pedigree. Unlike the Khawārij, the Shīʿa who stood up and revolted were men of great history and virtue, amongst them Ḥujr b. ʿAdī. His full name was Ḥujr b. ʿAdī b. Jabal b. ʿAdī b. Rabīʿah b. Muʿāwiya al-Akbar b. al-Ḥārith b. Muʿāwiya b. Thawr b. Bazīgh b. Kindī al-Kūfī. He was known as Ḥujr al-Khayr (Ḥujr the Good). There is a difference of opinion as to whether Ḥujr was a companion or if he was from the followers of the companions as he is included in the lists of both groupings. He fought in the Riddah wars and would later take part in the battle of al-Qādisīyyah on the Sassanian front.[831] He fought alongside ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib in both the Battle of the Camel and the Battle of Ṣiffīn and was one of his staunch supporters.[832]

Al-Mughīrah had cursed ʿAlī in his sermon. This caused outrage with Ḥujr and other worshippers who raised a cry that they would not accept such words and policies from the government. Al-Dīnawarī narrates that al-Mughīrah tried to win Ḥujr's support with a sum of five thousand dirhams, but this seems unlikely as the *dīwān* was providing Ḥujr with 2,500 dirhams at the time.[833] Al-Mughīrah died in 50/670 and Ziyād became governor of both

[831] Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, vol. 6, 151.
[832] Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, ed. ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Ṣābir (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1985), vol. 8, 51-2.
[833] Al-Dīnawarī, *al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, 223; Ibn al-Athīr, *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 1, 386.

K□fah and Ba□ra. □ujr and Ziy□d had known each other through previous skirmishes, both on the side of □Al□ and when they fought in opposition. □ujr was offered sums of money and different ranks within the government hierarchy but refused all the advances made by Ziy□d.[834] □Amr b. □urayth al-Makhz□m□ had been appointed as Ziy□d's representative in K□fah when he had left for Ba□ra. □Amr's speech, which was anti-□Al□ in its stance, was interrupted by □ujr and his partisans. Sin□n b. □urayth al-□abb□ was sent to inform Ziy□d in K□fah of what had happened. He conveyed to him the message that □ujr and his followers were now in a position of strength in K□fah. Ziy□d sent warnings to □ujr through personalities such as Jar□r b. □Abdull□h al-Baj□l□ and Kh□lid b. □Urfu□a al-□Udhr□ that such behavior would not be tolerated. □ujr could not tolerate their public attacks which sought to defile the character of □Al□, which he believed to be attacks against the very core of the religion of Islam. Shadd□d b. al-Haytham al-Hil□l□ was sent to □ujr but he did not make any breakthrough. Ziy□d was outraged and conveyed his outrage to the chiefs of K□fah including Qays b. al-Wal□d b. □Abd Shams b. al-Mugh□rah and Ab□ Bur□a b. Ab□ M□s□ al-Ash□□r□.

> O people of K□fah, you are wounding with one hand and sympathizing with the other. Your bodies are with me but your hearts are with □ujr that fool. You are with me while your kinsmen are with □ujr. This is dishonesty. You have to show me unqualified loyalty otherwise I shall send against you people who will bring you back and will destroy your pride.

The chiefs of K□fah vowed that their kinsmen would support Ziy□d

[834] Al-Isfah□n□, *al-Agh□n□* (Beirut, 1970), vol. 3, 16.

and leave Ḥujr.[835] It is interesting to note that the language used by Ziyād in describing Ḥujr as a fool and that the people of Kūfah were either with him or against him. The people of Kūfah's support for Ḥujr indicates distrust or, indeed, disenchantment, with Ziyād's rule and places a question mark on Muʿāwiyas choice of one governor for two districts.

Ziyād, recognizing the power of Ḥujr's stand, sent out groups to find Ḥujr. Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath b. Qays was given three days to find Ḥujr. If he did not, then all the palm trees that he owned and all his houses would be destroyed and he would be executed. Ḥujr had to flee, including movements made from al-Nakh', an area led by ʿAbdullāh b. al-Ḥārith al-Nakhaʿī towards ʿAzd. Muḥammad received a letter from Ḥujr that he would surrender himself if he were to be pardoned and be sent to Muʿāwiya, in expectation of amnesty from the caliph. Ḥujr b. Yazīd al-Kindī and Jarīr b. ʿAbdullāh al-Bajalī accompanied Muḥammad to Ziyād who granted Ḥujr amnesty in a prison cell for ten days.[836] Thirteen of Ḥujr's loyal partisans were pursued and captured by Ziyād. Saʿd b. Nimrān al-Hamdhānī, ʿUtbah b. al-Akhnās al-Saʿdī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥasan al-Ansī, ʿAbdullāh b. Ḥawʾyyah al-Tamīmī, Kidam b. Ḥayyān al-Ansī, Warqāʾ b. Sumayyah al-Bajalī, ʿAṣīm b. ʿAwf al-Bajalī, Qabīṣa b. Ḍabāy b. Ḥarmala al-ʿAbsī, Qabīṣa b. Ḍabāy, Sayf b. Fāʾil al-Shaybānī, Sharīk b. Shaddād al-Ḥaḍramī and al-Arqam b. ʿAbdullāh al-Kindī.[837] Amongst them was ʿUmr b. Ḥumq al-Khuzāʿī, a companion of Muḥammad. Reports indicate that he escaped but was caught by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUthmān al-Thaqafī, the governor of Moṣul and was killed and paraded through the streets.[838]

---

[835] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf,* vol. 4A, 214-215.
[836] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 121.
[837] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 218-219.
[838] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 2, 136.

W□□il b. □ujr al-□a□ram□ and Kath□r b. Shih□b al-□□rith□ were ordered to ensure □ujr was taken to Mu□□wiya, who arrogantly refused to meet □ujr, although he did meet Ziy□d's messengers. Two miles from Damascus, in Marj □Adhr□', □ujr and his companions were imprisoned.[839] Yaz□d b. Asad al-Bajal□ sought to advise Mu□□wiya to spread □ujr and his followers to different parts of the region and thus break their stand. Ziy□d, however, wanted a quick resolution to end their lives and keep stability in the region - 'If you desire the stability of this Mi□r, please do not send □ujr and his followers to K□fah again'.[840]

Each of □ujr's followers had kinsmen in Syria who sought to mediate on their tribesmen's behalf. □As□m and Warq□', both Bajal□s, were represented by Jar□r b. □Abdull□h al–Bajal□. Sa□d b. Numr□n al-Hamdhan□ received the backing of Humrah b. M□lik al-Hamdhan□, Kar□m b. □Af□f al-Khath□am□ received the backing of Shamir b. □Abdull□h al-Khath□am□. □ujr was represented by M□lik b. □ubayra al-Sak□n□, but to no avail. Mu□□wiya firmly believed that □ujr was the instigator and ordered that this innocent man who stood up against the injustice of the pulpits of K□fah was to be executed alongside six of his followers.[841] Shaban states that for Mu□□wiya 'it was effective, but unusually rash and high handed'.[842]

Analysis of Incident

What Khaled Keshk does not take into account amongst others who

[839] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 134.
[840] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, vol. 4A, 223.
[841] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f,* vol. 4A, 224; al-Yaʿq□b□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 2, 231.
[842] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 89-90.

seek to defend Mu□□wiya is the pre-Islamic definition of *□ilm* and its usage. According to the pre-Islamic definition of *□ilm*, the *□al□m* was a person renowned for his:

> calmness, balanced mind, self-control and steadiness of judgement. *□al□m* is a man who knows how to smother his feelings, to overcome his own blind passions and to remain tranquil and undisturbed whatever happens to him, however much he may be provoked.[843]

The *j□hil* was a:

> hot-blooded impetuous man, who tends to lose his self-control on the slightest provocation, and consequently to act wrecklessly, driven by an uncontrollable blind passion, without reflecting on the disastrous consequence this behavior might lead to. It is the behavior pattern peculiar to a man of an extremely touchy and passionate nature, who has no control of his own feelings and emotions, and who therefore, easily surrenders himself to the dictates of violent passions, losing the sense of what is right and what is wrong.[844]

Mu□□wiya' s act of killing □ujr was more an act of *jahl* than *□ilm* for it can be seen as an act of hot-bloodedness as well as wrecklessness, with very little display of tranquility and calmness which these attributes requires.

Keshk furthermore seeks to convey the theory that there is not a need for the historians to emphasize certain elements of the story of □ujr, and that when this is done, they are taking away from the fact that 'these sources had a primary purpose that was

[843] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 205.
[844] Izutsu, *God and Man in the Koran*, 205.

lost on modern scholars in their use of the Ḥujr story'.[845] The reply, however, is that the emphasis on these elements was to portray a clearer understanding of the motives and the backgrounds of the execution. The historians are all in agreement on four major parts of the narrative. The first is a discussion of the disagreement which occurred between Ḥujr, al-Mughīrah and Ziyād. The second is that they discuss the background to his disobedience of the authorities in Kūfah, the third is his arrest and the fourth is his execution. Keshk states that while they all agree they tend to emphasize one incident over another. Emphasis of one incident above another does not hide the over-arching question mark as to whether Muʿāwiya's conclusive decision concerning Ḥujr was that of a *ʿālim* or that of a *jāhil*.

A study of the works of the historians displays how their conclusions are that Muʿāwiya was the man who made the decision to kill Ḥujr. While Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ does not elaborate further on the background of the incident and simply states that Muʿāwiya killed Ḥujr in the year 50 AH,[846] Ibn Aʿtham clearly mentions that there was an active killing spree taking place at the time against the supporters of ʿAlī by Ziyād, which was undertaken to please Muʿāwiya. This does not reflect well on Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* as here he is portrayed as a bloodthirsty despot of the *jāhil* age.[847]

---

[845] K. Keshk, *The Historians' Muʿāwiya: The Depiction of Muʿāwiya in the Early Islamic Sources* (Saarbrucken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Muller Aktiengesellschaft, 2008), 104.
[846] Abū ʿAmr Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāṭ, *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ*, ed. Muṣṭafā Najīb Fawwāz and Ḥikmat Fawwāz (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1995), 131.
[847] Ibn Aʿtham, *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, 8 vols. (Ḥaydarabād: Dā'irat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmānīyyah, 1968-75), 203.

Furthermore, al-Balādhurī,[848] using Rawḥ b. ʿAbd al-Mu'min and ʿUmar b. Shabba b. ʿAbida b. Zayd b. Raiṭ al-Numayrī, al-Ṭabarī from ʿAlī b. Ḥasan and Muslim b. Abī Muslim al-Ḥaramī[849] and Ibn ʿAsākir[850] using Hishām b. Ḥasan concentrate on portraying two very important themes in the incident. The first theme which they are unanimous on is that Ḥujr is a martyr and not a rebel or dissident figure. Secondly, Ḥujr was a man of piety rather than Muʿāwiya or his soldiers. Muʿāwiya's lack of self-control is displayed by the fact that historians are unanimous in stating that it was Muʿāwiya who would encourage his governors to curse ʿAlī publically. This was begun under the leadership of al-Mughīrah and continued into the reign of Ziyād. Keshk does not accept that all the early historians are in agreement that it was Muʿāwiya who would find pleasure in the public cursing of ʿAlī. This important prelude to the incident of the killing of Ḥujr is narrated by al-Balādhurī,[851] al-Yaʿqūbī, al-Ṭabarī and Ibn al-Athīr. This could be seen as a clear sign of man driven by a blind uncontrolled passion with little or no reflection on the disastrous consequences of such an act, the behavior of a leader who is more *jāhil* than *ʿālim*. It is therefore not surprising to see Ibn al-Athīr's narration of Ziyād torturing Sayf b. Fāʿil for his refusal to take part in the cursing of ʿAlī. The despotic tendency of the leader was reflected by his governors.[852]

Al-Balādhurī continues to narrate that there were still good people who were willing to change their minds once they were

[848] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4, 243.
[849] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-al-mulūk,* ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, 11 vols. (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1960-1970), vol. 5, 256.
[850] Ibn ʿAsākir, *Tārīkh Medīnat Dimashq*, ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū Saʿīd ʿUmar b. Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī, 80 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995-2001).
[851] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4, 243; al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 218; al-Ṭabarī, vol. 5, 253-4; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 69-70.
[852] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 73.

informed of the sincerity of Ḥujr's cause. Amongst these were Ibn Khuraym al-Murrī and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Aswad b. ʿAbd Yaghūth al-Zuhrī, who both rejected the responsibility of executing Ḥujr once they knew of his true beliefs.[853]

Ibn ʿAsākir's narration concerning Ḥujr's death clearly displays that there was a lack of *ʿilm* in Muʿāwiya's decision. Muʿāwiya asks for advice concerning the killing of Ḥujr. The advice, however, is taken from men whose very attitude to the incident is wreckless and bloodthirsty, with little concern for the consequences of the killing and more concern for their position before the caliph. A man of *ʿilm* would be seen as a man who would smother his feelings and be steady in his judgement. However, Muʿāwiya does not fit either description. While Ibn ʿAsākir narrates that ʿAmr b. al-Aswad al-Ansī left the decision in Muʿāwiya's hands by telling him that he knew the people of Iraq better than anybody else,[854] Muʿāwiya listens to two personalities. One is clearly more rash in his conclusion and gives a speech based on flattery rather than sincere advice. The second displays a hint of *ʿilm*. He is seeking to offer an avenue of support for Ḥujr by making the caliph consider forgiveness as an option. The first is Abū Muslim al-Khawlānī, also known as ʿAbdullāh b. Thuwāb, who states:

> We have never hated you since we loved you, never disobeyed you since we obeyed you, never left you since we joined you, and never violated our oath of allegiance to you since we gave it. Our swords are on our shoulders; if you order us we will obey and if you call us we will heed.[855]

[853] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf,* vol. 4, 259-260.
[854] Ibn ʿAsākir, *Tārīkh Medīnat Dimashq*, vol. 12, 223-224.
[855] Ibn ʿAsākir, *Tārīkh*, vol. 12, 224.

This was followed by what is seemingly more wise advice from ʿAbdullāh b. Asad al-Qushayrī, who said:

> O Commander of the Faithful, your flock, your subject, and the people of your obedience. If you punish them, they have brough the punishment upon themselves, and if you forgive them for forgiveness is closer to piety, O Commander of the Faithful.[856]

Al-Tawḥīdī is clear in attacking ʿAlī's position and tactics in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. To al-Tawḥīdī, Muʿāwiyah is no doubt a man of worldly promises but is successful and true to his promises,[857] whereas ʿAlī, who is meant to be a warrior of piety, is deemed as being a man full of weakness.[858] He quotes one of ʿAlī's supporters, Abū Barza al-Aslamī, praising Muʿāwiyah's ability to be a man in control of his army, even though he does not display any bravery on the battlefield itself.[859]
To al-Tawḥīdī, ʿAlī's main weakness is his acceptance of the arbitration agreement at Ṣiffīn. Al-Tawḥīdī narrates two incidents concerning the agreement and the subsequent acceptance of Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī as his representative. One narration involves a women from the ʿAbs tribe who tells ʿAlī that three of his decisions have caused a major problem for him in the minds of his followers; the acceptance of the arbitration, taking the easiest route out of the problem, and his panic when events were getting difficult. ʿAlī, somewhat out of character tells her that she as a woman should not get involved and should go and sit, in stark contrast to his willingness to answer the Khārijīs at Ḥarūrā'.[860] Furthermore, he narrates an incident, where a Khārijī tells ʿAlī's grandson, Zayd, that ʿAlī was not

[856] Ibn ʿAsākir, *Tārīkh*, vol. 12, 224.
[857] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣā'ir wa-al dhakhā'ir*, vol. 8, 92.
[858] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣā'ir wa-al dhakhā'ir*, vol. 1, 169.
[859] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣā'ir wa-al dhakhā'ir*, vol. 1, 169.
[860] Al-Tawḥīdī, *al-Baṣā'ir wa-al dhakhā'ir*, vol. 8, 116.

as brave as ʿUthmān, for ʿUthmān faced death with courage while ʿAlī's courage was:

> only when he had a discerning mind and did not seek the world, when he did seek it, his courage was gone. For ʿUthmān was told that he was free to go wherever he wanted provided he gave up his office as head of the community. He refused, saying that he would not take off a robe with which God had clothed him, for which reason he was killed. As for ʿAlī, he was told: Put Abū Mūsā and ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ in charge of the arbitration or we will kill you. He chose to accept the arbitration.[861]

Furthermore, even ʿAbdullāh b. al-ʿAbbās tells ʿAlī not to accept and to allow him to be in the arbitration, but ʿAlī rejects this even though he would have been a match to ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ according to al-Tawwādī.[862]

Al-Tawwādī's attitude is very favourable to the Umayyads and he does not seem to be affected by having any ʿAbbāsid or partisan bias against them.[863] He even claims that Muʿāwiya's victory was written in the Qurʾān, where God states that:

> If anyone is slain wrongfully, We have given his heir authority to demand retaliation.[864]

He states that Umayyad rule in Islam was ineveitable. By the time the Prophet passed away, the Umayyads or many of their close allies were in seats of power, for example Khālid b. Saʿīd of Ḥanẓ' or ʿAbān b. Saʿīd b. al-ʿĀṣ of ʿUthmān. He states:

---

[861] Al-Tawwādī, *al-Baṣā'ir wa-al dhakhā'ir*, vol. 5, 186.
[862] Al-Tawwādī, *al-Baṣā'ir wa-al dhakhā'ir*, vol. 4, 243.
[863] Al-Tawwādī, *al-Baṣā'ir wa-al dhakhā'ir*, vol. 9, 182. Umayyads are fused with *ʿilm* (*udmijū bi'l-ʿilm idmājan*)
[864] Qur'ān 17:33.

> If the Prophet had laid down the foundation and made known their status to all people, how could their opinion not be strengthened, their hope stretched out, and their aspiration to power reinforced? Conversely, how could the aspiration of the Ban□ H□shim not be weakened, their expectation reduced, and their hope curbed? After all, this world, and religion in this world is accidental, and this world is desireable. At any rate, this and similar situations sharpened their teeth, opened wide their doors, filled their cups to the brim, and spliced their ropes, and signs antecede matters, and things are known be their foretokens. The Ban□ H□shim were privileged with the call to Islam, prophecy and the Qur□□n, but matters of the world are passed on from one group to another, so the Umayyads ended up with political dominance.[865] In this respect, a significant story has been narrated: Ab□ Sufy□n stood at the the grave of Hamza, the Prophet's uncle who was killed at the Battle of U□ud, i.e. when Ab□ Sufy□n and most of the Umayyads had not yet accepted the call to Islam. He said, 'May God have mercy on you, O Ab□ □Um□ra! You have fought us over a matter which has wound up to be ours!'[866]

J□□i□, however, attacks Mu□□wiya on the grounds of his misdeeds in the □iff□n arbitration, again helping diffuse anti-□Abb□sid Umayyad support.[867] Al-J□□i□ respects the fact the one cannot:

> deny that Mu□□wiya is noted for his intelligence, his *□ilm*, his shrewdness, his understanding, his cunning, his decisiveness, his energy and his resolution, as well as his remarkable eloquence and profoundity.[868]

---

[865] Al-Taw□□d□, *Kit□b al-imt□□ wa-al-mu□□nasah*, vol. 2, 73-75.
[866] Al-Taw□□d□, *Kit□b al-imt□□ wa-al-mu□□nasah*, vol. 2, 75.
[867] Ashtiany and Latham,*□Abb□sid Belles-Lettres,* 84.
[868] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□*, 66.

However, according to J□□i□'s definition of the caliph or leader of the state:

> exceptional merit and accomplishment are needed. This merit must either be manifest and known to all Muslims, so that with one accord they raise up a man to be first among them, and spontaneously appoint their ruler, not being under the threat of the sword.[869]

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, we have sought to look at the development of the term *□ilm* and it's application during Mu□□wiya's leadership. The distinction is made between Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* in terms of statecraft and administration, which we conclude as being exemplary, and his lack of *□ilm* in dealing with internal rebellions. His reaction to the rebels within his community, especially in the execution of □ujr, would lead us to conclude that his acts were *j□hil* rather than full of *□ilm*.

A *j□hil* would be a man of an extremely touchy and passionate nature, who has no control of his own feelings and emotions, and who therefore easily surrenders himself to the dictates of violent passions, losing the sense of what is right and what is wrong. □Abdull□h b. Qays was searching for the *□al□m* not the *j□hil*. However, □ujr and his companions were not spared, but were rather despotically executed. Their execution really emphasized one aspect of Mu□□wiya's own description of himself when he said:

> I apply not with my lash where my tongue suffices, nor my sword

[869] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□*, 66.

> where my whip is enough, and if there one hair binding me to my fellowmen, I let it not break. If they pull, I loosen, and if they loosen, I pull. But if I find myself persuaded to use the sword and there will be no other solution but to use it, I will.[870]

In conclusion, the inter-textual approach, using different genres of literature, highlights that Mu□□wiya's does not display *□ilm* in his dealings with □ujr, in contrast to Keskh's conclusions. Furthermore, our findings concerning Mu□□wiya's ruthlessness with □ujr allow us to differ with Petersen's conclusion and praise of Mu□□wiya's 'personal dilatoriness, his *□ilm*, which, as we know, was characteristic of his conduct as caliph. European languages lack a single term covering this Arabic concept. That special quality, held in so very high esteem by the Bedouin, implies that its possessor in all circumstances knows how to make up his mind and is able to anticipate the outcome of his course of action; it further implies that in order to attain his object, he acts only upon careful consideration and accurate timing, always without resorting to any unnecessary show of power, and wherever possible, utilizing, such forces as the situation itself might have set free. *□ilm* may thus be reflected in a kind of well considered opportunism'.[871] Mu□□wiya clearly does not act upon careful consideration and accurate timing.

It was a ruthless decision that was undertaken, with no self-control, tolerance or respect shown to the nobles who tried to intercede on behalf of □ujr. The offer to spread the men into different parts of the empire would no doubt have silenced his

[870] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, vol. 4A, 17.
[871] Petersen, *ʿAl□ and Muʿawiya*, 180.

critics and the critics of Ziyād. But the government had reached a stage where any dissident was not tolerated, especially those who continued to display love towards ʿAlī, his family and their political beliefs. In each case, Shaban concludes that Muʿāwiya acts as a despot, lacking self-control, in his dealings with Ḥujr:

> After a few unsuccessful warnings, the government took drastic action. The leaders of the *ex-qurrāʾ* were arrested and sent to Damascus where seven of them were ordered to be executed. These included Ḥujr ibn ʿAdī al-Kindī, a leader who had fought against the Riddah, had taken part in the first conquests of both Syria and Iraq, had contended the leadership of Kinda against the rising power of the Riddah leader, al-Ashʿath ibn Qays and had remained one of ʿAlī's most loyal supporters until after his death. Ḥujr and the other six who were executed stand out, in our sources, as the exemplary leaders of the *qurrāʾ*. Their execution was an unusual error on Muʿāwiyas part but indicates how powerful a threat Ḥujr and the *qurrāʾ* were to the stability of Kūfah.[872]

Furthermore, to Al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān, Muʿāwiya is viewed a man of deception and cunningness rather than as a man of *ʿilm*. ʿAlī orders that he be deposed from his governorship as soon as he becomes caliph. Muʿāwiya rejects the orders of the Imām of the state. To al-Nuʿmān, this is a clear display of the lack of respect by Muʿāwiya, an opinion enhanced by his coming together with ʿAmr and the promise of the governorship of Egypt if they are able to depose ʿAlī.[873] Al-Nuʿmān discusses the Battle of Ṣiffīn. Not only does he state they were fighting the Imām of the community, but they killed ʿAmmār b. Yāsir, who the Prophet

[872] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 89.
[873] "ʿUrjūza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān*, 70.

said will be killed by tyrants.[874] This he contended was not the act of a man revered for his self-control and clemency.This tyrannical rule would continue with Mu□□wiya appointing his 'debauched son Yaz□d to succeed him'.[875]

Chapter 6

Shuj□□a

[874] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 71.
[875] "□Urj□za", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Q□□□ an-Nu□m□n*, 81.

Theological and historical works from the 3rd to the 6th century discuss the importance of *shujāʿa* as a condition for leadership.[876] The *khalīfah*'s role was to defend the Muslim community from opposition and outside forces. The second role is to remove oppression and address the grievances of the citizens of the state.[877] Many of Muʿāwiya's battles are described within the corpus of narrations, and he is viewed as the ideal commander. Bravery and courage were viewed as great attributes, required in the makeup of any great leader. Amongst the personal virtues of a caliph would be *shujāʿa*, whereas an examination of his life would reveal a lack of personal courage. This chapter will examine the attribute of courage in light of his military campaigns, as well as his lack of personal courage displayed upon the death of ʿUthmān and at the Battle of Ṣiffīn. Furthermore, a study of the evolution of the term *shujāʿa* raises questions as to whether Muʿāwiya could be described as a man of courage both according to the pre-Islamic and the Qurʾānic definition. He certainly was not as wreckless as the men of *shujāʿa* in pre-Islamic Arabia but not necessarily a chivalrous and brave caliph.

Introduction to *Shujāʿa*

الشجاعة, pronounced as *'ash-shujā-ʿa',* is correctly translated as 'bravery and courage' since they are similar in definitions. Bravery is listed in the English dictionary as 'having or showing courage'. **الشجاعة** 'Ash-shujā-ʿa' originates from the verb **شجع** (*shajuʿ*) which is to **اشتد عند الباس** 'become strong in a tough

[876]Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār*, 160; "Urujuza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qaṣīda al-Numūnī*, 27; al-Mufīd, *Kitāb al-Irshād,* 3; al-Ashʿarī, *Kitāb al-Lumaʿ,* text and translation in McCarthy, *Theology,* 115; al-Shīrāzī, *al-Ishārah*, 176; al-Dīb, *Imām al-Ḥaramayn,* 145.
[877] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Tamhīd*, 185-186.

situation' and الشجاعة 'ash-shaj□-□a' is شدة القلب في الباس 'strength of the intellect at a difficult situation and not the heart' although القلب is the heart.[878] *Shuj□□a* was viewed as being amongst the moral ideals of pre-Islamic Arabia and one which was compatible with the monotheistic faith of Islam. This was amongst the ethical qualities espoused by the Qur□□n and was the old Arab worldview as well. *Shuj□□a* was amongst the highest virtues possessed by the people of the deserts and was seen as a vital component when defining manliness or *mur□wah*. Physical strength and military prowess was highly revered in a land where the forces of nature were so severe against the citizens of the state. The mainspring of life was very much defined by the bloodiest battle between individuals or tribes. This can be seen in the poetry of □ir□r al-Kha□□□b when he states:

> My lineage goes not back to weaklings and unarmoured, nor to some abject, miserable coward on the battlefield,
> But a son of those warriors am I, who used to smite the streaks of the helms whenever they met them, Who with long sword-belts, imperturbably went to death.[879]

Shuj□□a was both positive and aggressive, and not simply seen as a defensive weapon. The poet Zuhayr describes how *shuj□□a* in non-Arab circles was what would be described as cruelty and pure ferocity displayed in any tribal feud:

> It is not enough for a warrior, fierce as a lion, to strike back and chastise his enemy when the latter has struck him a blow, he should rather take the initiative and become an aggressor when no

[878] Im□m Jam□l al-D□n b. Man□□r al-Ma□r□, *Lisan al-□Arab* (Beirut: D□r □□dir, 1955-56), vol. 8, 173.
[879] T. Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1966), 84.

> one wrongs him.[880]

It was an honor for a man to be described as courageous and brave, as Ka□b b. M□lik seeks to describe such a man as:

> unfaltering in danger, no weakling they; bold and intrepid against their enemy in every arena of battle.[881]

However, in pre-Islamic Arabia, this was a characteristic based on impulse, and at times could be very reckless, for example when *shuj□□a* was displayed for *shuj□□a's* sake and not for any higher goal. Under Islam, the meaning of *shuj□□a* undertook a transformation, ultimately becoming a characteristic whose sole aim was the pleasure of the religion of God.
The Qur□□n is replete with verses praising the soldiers who fight in the front lines in the way of God, seeking to spread the religion of God and willing to lose their lives in the process. Such verses would repeat the phrase, 'In the Way of God', to ensure that the intention was not individualistic, mundane or built upon selfish egoistic grounds:

> O ye who believe! fight the unbelievers who gird you about, and let them find firmness in you: and know that Allah is with those who fear Him.[882]

> Will ye not fight people who violated their oaths, plotted to expel the Messenger, and took the aggressive by being the first (to assault) you? Do ye fear them? Nay, it is Allah Whom ye should more justly fear, if ye believe! Fight them, and Allah will punish them by your hands, cover them with shame, help you

[880] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 84
[881] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 84.
[882] Qur□□n 9:123-4.

> (to victory) over them, heal the breasts of Believers, and still the indignation of their hearts. For Allah will turn (in mercy) to whom He will; and Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise.[883]

Both the Battles of U□ud and Mu'tah are remembered as battles where the lack of *shuj□□a* and the running away of soldiers from the battlefield was a moral stain that remained on many of them forever. To run away from the battlefield was seen as a disgrace in pre-Islamic Arabia and indeed this continued to be the case with the onset of the principles of the religion of Islam. Indeed, some of the companions, upon their return from the battle of Mu'tah, were attacked with dirt by the people, who shouted, 'O you runaways! How dare you flee in the way of God?' Others could not leave their homes and pray with the Prophet for they were constantly heckled in the streets. When Salamah b. Hish□m's wife was asked why her husband was not to be seen in the congregational prayer with the Prophet, she replied by stating that it was impossible for him to leave his house without hearing the words, 'Coward! You fled in God's way!'[884] The Qur□□n would also act as a reminder:

> O ye who believe! when ye meet the Unbelievers in hostile array, never turn your backs to them. If any do turn his back to them on such a day - unless it be in a stratagem of war, or to retreat to a troop (of his own)- he draws on himself the wrath of Allah, and his abode is Hell,- an evil refuge (indeed)![885]

> Those who believe in Allah and the Last Day ask thee for no exemption from fighting with their goods and persons. And Allah knoweth well those who do their duty. Only those ask thee for

[883] Qur□□n 9:13-15.
[884] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 85.
[885] Qur□□n 8:15-16.

> exemption who believe not in Allah and the Last Day, and whose hearts are in doubt, so that they are tossed in their doubts to and fro.[886]

Furthermore, not only were those who fled seen as cowards, but those who claimed to believe yet would never turn up to the war, making excuses, were viewed as not being true Muslims:

> They swear by Allah that they are indeed of you; but they are not of you: yet they are afraid (to appear in their true colours).[887]

The Qur□□n sought to guide and direct the *shuj□□a* of pre-Islamic Arabs by making it an act solely for the purpose of God and one for which people will be made accountable on the Last Day. The test of the man of bravery was to attend battle first and then not to turn on his heels in moments of danger. Ab□ Isḥ□q al-Sh□r□z□ reveres Abu Bakr's *shuj□□a* in his leadership of the Riddah wars. He was not willing to stop the army which was originally prepared by the Prophet, and was ready to engage in war until the poor-rate was payed and justice was achieved. Moreover, al-Sh□r□z□ describes Ab□ Bakr as being braver than □Al□ because □Al□ was told by the Prophet that he would one day be killed by a man known as Ibn Muljam, and this would also be repeated by □Al□ himself when he would see Ibn Muljam. However, Ab□ Bakr would enter the battlefield not knowing when he would be killed or by whom, and this would therefore be a sign of his bravery.[888] Al-Q□□□ al-Nu□m□n describes the importance of bravery as a characteristic of the caliph of the time:

> He should also be the first among the community to have undergone

[886] Qur□□n 9:44-45.
[887] Qur□□n 9:56.
[888] Al-Sh□r□z□, *al-Ish□rah*, 176.

> the hardships of fighting and taking the leading role in the military campaigns of the Prophet. He should be the closest person to the Prophet in relationship, affection and obedience. Moreover, he should be the most abstemious person and the best among the community in physical appearance as well as character.[889]

When one examines Mu□□wiya's exploits on the battlefield and on the sea, we can easily see that both lack of attendance and turning and fleeing are evident and raises questions as to his bravery as leader of the Muslims. What many of these battles indicate is not *shuj□□a*, but rather very good military planning and commanding, and not the personal virtue expected of a great leader.

Mu□□wiya and *Shuj□□a*

Military Campaigns as Caliph

Byzantine

When Mu□□wiya assumed the caliphate in the year 41/661, he sent a number of expeditions aiming to invade Byzantine territories. Importantly one notices here a trend developing in his leadership where he deploys troops rather than participating on the front lines alongside them. The pre-Islamic as well as Islamic definitions of *shuj□□a* seek to view the soldier as being in the front line, ready to sacrifice his life before the lives of others. □ab□b b. Maslamah al-Fihr□ raided Byzantine territory without any success in 41/661. Bisr b. Ar□□h, who was Commander

[889] "Urujuza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qa□□ al-Num□n* 27.

in Chief, reached Constantinople and troops were wintered in Qalunia by the head of the expedition, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khālid b. al-Walīd, in 43/663.[890] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Khālid b. al-Walīd continued to lead different expeditions. Some of these failed while others proved to be fruitful. He wintered his troops in Caludiopolis in the year 44/664 and then advanced to Ancyra, meeting the Byzantine close to Lake Caralis. However, these attacks failed and he also failed in his attempt to besiege the Citadel of Sillos as well. He attacked the cities on the Western coast of Asia Minor including Pergamon and Smyrna. He died shortly after in the city of Ḥims. Many of Muʿāwiya's soldiers would be dying as well, while Muʿāwiya would remain in his seat of power. The fact that he is not on the frontlines highlights a lack of *shujāʿa* in terms of his position as caliph.

This lack of *shujāʿa* is evident when studying how Muʿāwiya continued to send expeditions after the death of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. Mālik b. ʿAbdullāh al-Khathʿamī reached Antioch and Pisidia having led a summer expedition in the year 46/666. At Rahwat Mālik, an area close to the frontier post in the al-Jazīra province, whatever booty was gained was distributed by Mālik to the soldiers.[891] Their aim was to enter Byzantine territory and Constantinople for the first time. Winter expeditions were led by Mālik and Ibn Hubayrah al-Sakūnī and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Qaynī, who wintered in Byzantine territory in 47/667 and 48/668, with ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Qaynī reaching the province of Isaurie.[892] Byzantine territory was finally invaded by three different divisions within an expedition - the first being led by Mālik b. Hubayrah al-Sakūnī who, having wintered in Byzantine land, was

[890] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 239.
[891] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 240.
[892] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 240.

followed by ʿAbdullāh b. Kurz al-Bajalī in Garraba and finally Kharshūn, where Faḍalah b. ʿUbayd al-Laythī al-Anṣārī stayed for the summer with his expedition.[893]

Muʿāwiya's advancement was helped by the turmoil that affected the leadership at the helm of Constantinople. Ten years earlier, it was Muʿāwiya's internal struggle with ʿAlī that meant he would have to conclude a peace treaty and even agree to pay the tribute to the emperor in 39/639.[894] However, in the year 49/669, Constantinople was a land blighted with revolts. Two top lieutenants of Emperor Constantine the Fourth, who had now succeeded his father, namely Mizirus and Sillious, had revolted against the emperor.[895] Muʿāwiya saw the opportunity and sent an army with renowned personalities such as ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr and Abī Ayyūb al-Anṣārī. Once again, he did not stand on the front lines. Although they besieged Chalcedon, the army had to face continuous trials and tribulations, including having to suffer the pangs of viruses such as small pox. Yazīd was coerced by his father to join the army after Faḍalah b. ʿUbayd had called for reinforcements and support.[896] Constantinople was besieged for six months when reinforcements were sent by Muʿāwiya, however, the Arabs retreated due to conditions, both physical and emotional.[897]

Expeditions were being sent throughout the empire but with the leader remaining behind rather than on the frontiers. Muʿāwiya b. ʿudayj al-Sakūnī led a sea expedition of two hundred warships

[893] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 240.
[894] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 157.
[895] George Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), 110-111.
[896] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 458-9.
[897] Philip K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 201.

against Sicily. The booty would be plundered and used as commodities for trade as far as India. The booty was initially sent to Ba□ra and from there it was to be exchanged for goods within the Indian markets.[898] The Byzantines sought revenge attacks as well, and in that same year, attacked the Syrian coast. Mu□□wiya ensured that a new dock yard would be built in Antioch and that there would be a transfer of thousands of families, and workmen from Persia and □ims as well as workmen of Indian origin known as the Say□bija.[899] Rhodes was also reoccupied through an expedition led by Jan□dah b. Umayyah in 52/672, and the Arabs made it their home through cultivation of the fertile land.[900]

In the year 54/674, the Arabian fleet was preparing itself for the order from Mu□□wiya for his second expedition against Constantinople. They occupied the land of Cyzicus, by crossing the Aegean sea and the Hellespont and thus entering through Propontis. They stayed in Cyzicus in the winter time, and established the area as the base. The city would be raided by the Arabs in the spring and the summer but after occupying the coast of Cilicia, the siege from sea was more effective.[901] The Arabs, although involved in a number of clashes, were advancing towards the walls of the city. Two important expeditions, led by M□lik b. □Abdull□h al-Khath□am□ and □Umar b. al-□ub□b al-Sulam□ were pivotal in entering Byzantine territory. M□lik wintered there in 58/578 while □Umar b. al-□ub□b occupied the city of Camacha by the Euphrates in 59/679.[902]

---

[898] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 235.
[899] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 147-8.
[900] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 157.
[901] Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine States*, 111.
[902] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 184.

Six years of bombardment and constantly attempting to siege Constantinople was met by bravery on the part of the Byzantines, who were willing to sacrifice all they had to protect the city. Mu□□wiya, meanwhile, while deploying soldiers to act on the offensive, was not willing to fight and finally conquer Constantinople himself. None of his soldiers would ever describe him as a man of *shuj□□a.* Mu□□wiya had failed to conquer Constantinople. A thirty year peace treaty was concluded between him and the Byzantines. To add insult to the already great losses and injuries, three thousand gold pieces were to be paid to the emperor in addition to being compelled to send fifty horses and prisoners.[903]

North Africa

When Mu□□wiya became caliph, he had a vision of changing the state of affairs in North Africa. Expeditions were to recommence under the leadership of □Amr b. al-□□s. □Uqbah b. N□f□, □Amr's nephew, was ordered to invade North Africa. Mu□□wiya would sit and dictate from his seat of power rather than with □Amr or □Uqbah, who would be noted wfor their *shuj□□a* in contrast to the caliph. Libya and Maraqya were both conquered by □Uqbah. Berber tribes such as the Luw□tah and the Zan□tah all paid allegiance to □Uqbah.[904] Ghadamis shortly followed in the year 42/662. Labdah was occupied the following year with the help of Shurayk b. Sumayy al-Ghutayl□. Al-□abar□ narrates that upon their return, □Amr b. al-□□s passed away after having fallen ill.[905] □

One again, it is Mu□□wiya's military commanding and planning

[903] Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine States*, 112.
[904] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 3, 354.
[905] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 28.

that is to be revered rather than the personal virtue of *shujāʿa*. Within a year, ʿUqbah had completely taken over the whole of the Fezzān and Qasṭīlīya provinces. Such a feat was achieved though re-occupation of the land of Waddān and successes in marches on the farms of Farmah, Jawān and Qafṣah. However, ʿUqbah was known to be ruthless and reports indicate his ill treatment of the chiefs of the Berbers, in areas such as Sart and Khāwār. According to the agreed peace treaty, slaves were to be given to ʿUqbah from each of the chiefs of the tribes.[906]

Ruwayfiʿ b. Thābit al-Anṣārī, representative of Muʿāwiya b. Hudayj, was sent to lead a campaign against Jarabbah in the year 47/667 and emerged successful. He would eventually enter the town of ʿafrūṭ. His respect to the caliph, Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān - as well as the fact that he had numerous kinsmen in Egypt in addition to these victorious campaigns - eventually led to his appointment as governor of Egypt in 47/667. This was a man whose importance and loyalty to Muʿāwiya can never be underestimated. His loyalty reached a point where he was willing to kill Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr and stand firmly alongside Muʿāwiya in fighting ʿAlī.[907]

Muʿāwiya's death and Yazīd's succession brough a halt to the advances in North Africa until the return of ʿUqbah b. Nāfiʿ under Yazīd. Al-Qayrawān was now the base for administrative issues and for the gathering of Arab fighters. Furthermore, the halt on advances in North Africa does not reveal that Yazīd was less brave than his father or lacked valour, but was possibly

[906] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr* (al-Qāhirah: Maktabat al-Thaqāfah al-Dīnīyah, 1995), 194-5.
[907] Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr*, 198.

because he was not as good a planner or military commander in his own reign as caliph. None of these expeditions reveal the *shujāʿa* of Muʿāwiya personally, but rather his expertise at planning and achieving success from his base in Shām. On many occasions, even this portrayal is rather inflated according to Noth, for the commanders were achieving many successes without the need of commands from the caliphal office.

Central Asia

Muʿāwiya deputized ʿAbdullāh b. Āmir to govern Baṣra, Khurāsān and Sīstān upon taking office in 41/661. Upon reaching Baṣra, ʿAbdullāh b. Āmir decided that he needed to send some of his men to represent him in the garrison town of Khurāsān. He sent Qays b. al-Haytham al-Sulamī who faced a revolt in Bādghīs, Herāt and Balkh. The famous shrine of Nawbahār was destroyed when he recaptured Balkh. However, the agreement he made with the people of Balkh did not stipulate that a certain amount of money was to reach Iraq. He was dismissed by ʿAbdullāh b. Āmir and his successor, ʿAbdullāh b. Khāzim al-Sulamī, ensured that money was to be sent to Iraq after the conclusion of the agreement.[908]

Sīstān, Zarang and its leadership were re-captured in an expedition led by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Samūra b. Habīb b. ʿAbd Shams and his accompanying entourage .ʿAbd al-Raḥmān was appointed as Muʿāwiya's governor in the now-independent Sīstān governorship. He was replaced in the year 45/665 by al-Rabīʿ b. Ziyād al-Ḥārithī.[909] While it may be argued that Muʿāwiya's tactics were successful and brave, his success was actually owed

[908] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 66.
[909] Shaban, *The Abbasid Revolution* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 28.

to the soldiers who lost their lives in central Asia. He was also willing to dismiss governors and representatives whom he felt were not achieving results. This was a clear sign of his *ʿilm* as a leader. Both ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmīr and al-Ḥārith b. ʿAbdullāh al-Azdī had served for relatively short periods until they were dismissed in order to pave the way for Ziyād b. Abī Sufyān to take over the administrative affairs of Sīstān and Khurāsān in his capacity as governor of Baṣra. Ziyād was a ruthless administrator as well as one who would organize as he deemed fit. Khurāsān was to be divided into four independent districts, a move he initiated as soon as he became governor of Baṣra. A governor was appointed to administer the affairs of each district: ʿUmar b. Aʿmer al-Yashkurī was to govern Merv, Khālid b. ʿAbdullāh al-Ḥanafī governed Nishāpūr, Marwarūdh was governed by Qays b. al-Haytham al-Sulamī. Herāt, Bādghīs, Pūshang and Qadis were governed by Nāfiʿ b. Khālid al-Ṭāhī al-Azdī.[910]

Muʿāwiya and the Murder of ʿUthmān

ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān occupied a prominent position in Arabian and Islamic circles. He was a member of the branch of Abū al-ʿĀṣ within the Umayyad family. He was also a member of the tribe of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭallib as he was related to the Prophet. The Prophet's first cousin Arwā bt. Kurayz, daughter of Bayḍa' bt. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭallib, was ʿUthmān's mother.[911] Known as being amongst the earliest Muslims, he was given, according to certain reports, the lofty status of being named as one of the ten who were granted paradise by the Prophet.[912] Furthermore, he was

[910] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 79.
[911] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣāba*, vol. 2, 462.
[912] Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 7, 140.

deputed by the Prophet in Medīna when the Prophet marched towards the Battles of Dhāt al-Riqā’ and Ghatafān.[913] He was married to the Prophet’s daughter Ruqayyah and from this marriage he had a son named ʿAbdallāh who died in childhood.[914]

ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān became caliph of the Islamic state at the age of seventy.[915] Previously, he had been an important figure in the caliphate of Abū Bakr helping him direct the affairs of the state. Abū Bakr had sought his advice when nominating ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb to lead the state. He succeeded ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb who had died after being wounded in his prayers.[916] He was chosen through consultation to lead the Islamic state.[917] There were other members of the Umayyads who were alive, including Muʿāwiya b. Abū Sufyān, Saʿīd b. al-ʿĀṣ, al-Walīd b. ʿUqbah and Marwān b. al-Ḥakām but he was the first of the Umayyads to become caliph. Muʿāwiya b. Abū Sufyān was from the Umayyad branch of Ḥarb and al-Walīd b. ʿUqbah was from the branch of Abū ʿAmr. Marwān, however, belonged to the same Umayyad branch as ʿUthmān, the branch of Abū al-ʿĀṣ.[918] Muʿāwiya would look to claim the caliphate in the future.

Although ʿUthmān was caliph, the most disciplined and organized part of the state was headed by Muʿāwiya. Muʿāwiya was independent and the troops were firmly under his command.[919] Maritime warfare in the Mediterranean was conducted through his leadership after he had been given permission by ʿUthmān,

---

913 Ibn Sa’d, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, vol. 3, 56-7.
914 Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 420/1, 3056.
915 Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 416-18.
916 Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 233/1, 2786.
917 Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam*, 26.
918 Al-Walīd b. ʿUqbah b. Abū Muʿayṭ (Abān) b. Abū ʿAmr b. Umayyah in Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Muṣʿab b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Muṣʿab al-Zubayrī, *Nasab Quraysh* (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif lil-Ṭibāʿah wa-al-Nashr, 1953), 134-8.
919 Henri Lammens, “Muʿāwiya”, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam,* 2nd edition (Leiden: Brill, 1954-66), vol. 3, 617.

permission which was not previously granted to him by ʿUmar.[920] The Byzantines were deterred through the formation of strong garrison towns on the coast. Syria was stable due to his organizational skills as well as the bravery of the soldiers under his command. He had a stranglehold on Syria, established as an Arab front by Abū Bakr.[921] Even ʿĀʾisha's threat to send a man to kill him was met with bravery and confidence, with Muʿāwiya replying that Syrians were ready to protect him at all times. Such an act was seen as impossible.[922]

To ʿUthmān, the fact that his predecessor had nominated Muʿāwiya to become governor of Syria and had not thought of dismissing him was enough to help him keep Muʿāwiya in power.[923] ʿUmar, according to Caetani, held the Umayyads in high esteem and wanted to ensure they were given leading roles in government affairs.[924] However, Madelung argues that there were few if any serious rivals to Muʿāwiya, and that the only serious rival, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, was positioned by ʿUmar in Egypt.[925] Furthermore, ʿUthmān used the wives of the Prophet as proof of why Muʿāwiya deserved to remain at the helm of Syrian affairs. In a letter which was read by ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAbbās to the Meccan community, he declares that the wives noted that Muʿāwiya was respected by his people in the time of ʿUmar and the troops were firmly behind him.[926] The Meccan merchant aristocracy also wanted to ensure that they had safeguarded their interests financially after having established the Arab financial administration in

[920] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 258-260, 2823-4
[921] Martin Hinds, "Muʿāwiya I", *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: Brill, 1993), vol. 7, 264.
[922] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 251.
[923] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 338/1, 2939.
[924] *Annali*, vol. 4, 30-1; vol. 5, 496, cited by Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 61.
[925] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 61.
[926] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 410/1, 3043.

Syria through co-operating with the Byzantine officials.[927] Therefore, a number of reasons emerge as to why Mu□□wiya remained the governor of Syria. He himself tells □a□□a□ah b. S□h□n, in reply to those who tell him he should resign, about his place of excellence and precedence in Islam:

> I have priority in Islam, but the others have better priority than I. But, in my period as governor, there is no one better able to do my job than I. □Umar b. al-Kha□□□b was of this opinion, and if there had been a man more capable than I, □Umar would not have been gentle in regard to me or anyone else. I have not committed any wrongdoing that would require me to resign my office. If the caliph and the Muslim community thought so, he would have written to me by his own hand and I would have stepped down from the office.[928]

A number of internal problems and issues began to affect □Uthm□n's caliphate. The first was a public dispute between Sa□d b. Ab□ Waqq□□ and □Abdull□h b. Mas□□d. Having requested a loan from the treasury, Sa□d refused to pay back the outstanding amount. The issue became a public scandal. This was not just an issue of finance, but a war of words between two companions of the Prophet. Sa□d was removed from his post as governor and was replaced by □Uthm□n's half-brother, al-Wal□d b. □Uqbah. Al-Wal□d was then involved in a public scandal and was a man who had a habit of being drunk, both publically and privately.[929] He was dismissed in the year 30/650 and was replaced by Sa□□d b. al-□□s. □Uthm□n had raised the orphaned Sa□□d and would eventually reside with Mu'□wiya.[930]

---

[927] E. Petersen, "□Al□ and Mu'□wiya: The Rise of the Ummayad Caliphate 656-661", *Acta Orientalia*, 23, (1955), 159.
[928] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 4, 324/1, 2919.
[929] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 4, 273-9/1, 2843-52.
[930] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 4, 278/1, 2850.

However, the dismissal of ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ was the decision that would prove to be the most controversial and decisive for ʿUthmān reign in power. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ had been governor of Egypt from the time of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb alongside ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿd, as Egypt had two governors at the helm, the state divided between them.[931] ʿAmr had sought complete control but this option was flatly refused by ʿUthmān, who decided to give the governorship to ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿd.[932] They had disputed concerning tax collection and ʿUthmān decided in favour of ʿAbdullāh, a person who he knew was appointed by ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and could therefore be trusted. He was given control of tax collection and the army.[933] Of the utmost importance is the little trust which ʿUthmān put in ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ in contrast to the amount of trust which was displayed by Mu'āwiya towards him, who was seemingly unperturbed by ʿUthmān's hesitancy in dealing with ʿAmr and his cunningness.

His family would be submitting to his orders and not as outspoken as those people who he had known for years but were now looking to protect their own interests.[934] Al-Balādhurī, however, concludes that nepotism was the ultimate aim of ʿUthmān's decisions when it came to appointing people for different posts. This would lead to his murder.[935] Nepotism is evident when examining the posts given to Marwān, al-Walīd and Muʿāwiya, where Madelung states that 'the unabashed favouritism towards his close kin that he showed from the beginning of his

[931] Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam, *Futūḥ Miṣr wa-Akhbāruha* (Baghdad, 1967), 173-4.

[933] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 256/1, 2819.
[934] Hinds, "The Murder of the Caliph ʿUthmān'', *IJMES*, 453.
[935] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4A, 512, I, 1328.

reign stood in marked contrast to this commitment'.[936] Madelung discusses an anecdote where ʿUthmān is criticised for giving 100, 000 dirhams to his nephew Saʿīd b. al-ʿĀṣ and people such as ʿAlī and Ṭalḥa already making representations towards him. However, he replies to them that, although Abū Bakr and ʿUmar would be rewarded for withholding gifts to their kith and kin, 'I seek reward by giving to my kin'.[937]

Hawting concluded that Egypt and Baṣra were handed over to members of the Umayyad clan. To Hawting, ʿUthmān is used by the Umayyads to help them gain ascendancy within political affairs and help build a strong powerbase:

> There are a number of possible explanations for the rise of opposition to ʿUthmān, and Muslim traditions preserve whole lists of accusations made against him by his opponents. Prominent amongst these accusations is the charge that he practiced nepotism by appointing the Umayyad relatives to important offices in the state. Indeed, we are told that in addition to confirming Muʿāwiya as governor of Syria, ʿUthmān appointed Umayyads to the governorates in Egypt, Kūfah and Baṣra, and that he gave the important office of the keeper of the caliphal seal to another relative, the father of the future Umayyad caliph Marwān. This has been interpreted as being no more than a way in which ʿUthmān sought to increase his personal control in the provinces at a time when important administrative problems were arising, but more traditionally, it has been seen as a result of his personality and the ability of his clever and unscrupulous family to exploit his weakness.[938]

Muʿāwiya, however, seemingly recognizes the dangers facing

[936] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 81.
[937] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 81.
[938] Hawting, *The First Dynasty*, 26-7.

ʿUthmān in that period. His words of advice indicate that he sought to advise him to beware of the issues that were facing him and the opposition movements which were against him. He offered him sanctuary in Syria, but ʿUthmān refused. He then offered to send an army to protect him, although this did not mean that he himself would join the army. This again is refused. Muʿāwiya concludes that ʿUthmān will either be 'attacked or assassinated' with ʿUthmān replying that he has 'placed his trust in God'.[939] Had ʿUthmān listened to the Umayyads unconditionally, then he would have followed this piece of advice, which would have helped him when one examines later events.

An argument for Muʿāwiya's *shujāʿa* can be examined in light of a threatening message he sent to ʿalīa, ʿAlī and al-Zubayr, after the meetings which were taking place in Mecca at the height of ʿUthmān's struggle. His words indicate a hope that the caliphate would eventually reach him as well as his attachment to the definition of leadership which preceded Islam rather than that which was instituted by the Prophet. Precedence in entering the religion as well as acquaintance with legal knowledge were the main criteria for appointing a leader within the circles and discussions of the Muhājirūn. If they held onto these and protected ʿUthmān then the people would follow. However, if ʿUthmān was to be neglected, then they would be involved in a struggle for power, and to Muʿāwiya, the Umayyads would not be defeated in such a struggle, with a return to the system of rule in pre-Islamic Arabia.[940] In the presence of ʿUthmān he warns the companions:

[939] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 345/1, 2949.
[940] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 344/1, 2946-9

> Talk has spread, and I fear for your sakes. If you have a grievance, here is my hand in help. Do not encourage the people to aspire to your level of power, for by God, if they do, you will never see them do anything but turn away from you.[941]

However, this *shujāʿa* is questioned when ʿUthmān asks for help from Muʿāwiya, who delays his reaction and does not send the troops which he has built and organized. In this precarious time, when his relative is under siege, not only does he not rise and defend him but he delays sending an army to help him. The Medinans had renounced their oath of allegiance to ʿUthmān, yet Muʿāwiya, knowing the difficulties ʿUthmān faced, seems more inclined to build his power base than to protect the future of ʿUthmān's political foundations. This was also the opinion of ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAbbās.[942]

Nor does Muʿāwiya show any *shujāʿa* when examining his participation within the wars of the First *Fitnah*. Many of the Umayyads who had fought ʿAlī at the Battle of the Camel had sought refuge with Muʿāwiya, who was sitting in Syria and was very well protected from every angle.[943] ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥakam and ʿUtbah b. Abī Sufyān had participated in the battle and then sought sanctuary in Muʿāwiya's province. The only Umayyad who did not seek sanctuary with Muʿāwiya was Marwān, as he was protected by Mālik b. Mismaʿ of the tribe of ʿAnza, until he eventually returned to Medīna with al-Aswad b. Abī al-Bakhtarī.[944] Muʿāwiya, however, was not the pivotal figure whom the Umayyads sought to rally around. When ʿAlī would send letters to Muʿāwiya seeking his allegiance, Muʿāwiya would

---

[941] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 4, 344/1, 2948.
[942] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf,* vol. 4A, 105-6.
[943] Ibn al-Athir, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 251.
[944] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 4, 530/536/541-2/1, 3213/3220-8.

refuse.[945] Mu□□wiya replied with a scroll with no writing on it, sent in the hands of his servant Qahisa, who, upon □Al□'s questioning on the current climate within Syrian circles, replied by stating that 'sixty thousand men cry below □Uthm□n's shirt in Damascus'.[946]

Ironically, the main supporter in the mission to avenge □Uthm□n's death was □Amr. Why would □Amr be so keen to avenge the death of a man who dismissed him from his post as governor of Egypt, a man who he left to die alone while residing in Palestine? The question may also be posed as to whether □Amr was simply being used as a scapegoat. Hawting comments that:

> During this *fitnah* he appears as Mu□□wiya's evil genius, though this is perhaps a device to save the reputation of Mu□□wiya to some extent, and the implication is that he supported Mu□□wiya to win back the governorship of Egypt.[947]

Furthermore, the sudden display of urgency by Mu□□wiya in avenging the death of □Uthm□n, a display that could and surely would have proved to be more fruitful if displayed at an earlier juncture in the political crisis which faced □Uthm□n in Med□na. Later traditions seek to indicate that □Uthm□n wanted to resort to repressive tactics in murdering those who opposed his rule. Madelung believes that such traditions emerged after:

> the civil war, used to bloody government repression and violence among Muslims, offering stories that □Uthm□n wrote to Mu□□wiya and □Abd All□h ibn □□m□r requesting them to send troops to Med□na and that they responded to his requests. Mu□□wiya's great

[945] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 4, 164-5.
[946] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 4, 444/1, 3089-91.
[947] Hawting, *The First Dynasty*, 28.

> grandson Ḥarb ibn Khalīd ibn Yazīd was perhaps the first to claim that Muʿāwiya sent Ḥabīb ibn Maslamah al-Fihrī with 4, 000 Syrians to aid ʿUthmān. The vanguard 1, 000 men under Yazīd ibn Asad al-Bajalī, had reached Wādī l-Qurā or Dhū Khushub when they learned of the murder of ʿUthmān and turned back. The story was taken up by the pro-Umayyad Maslamah ibn Muḥarrib in Baṣra and by al-Shaʿbī in Kūfah.[948]

However, ʿUthmān wanted to protect the blood of his Muslim brethren, and recognized the sanctity of their lives. He did not want a civil war to begin. Yet ʿAlī, who it may be argued was constantly interacting and advising ʿUthmān in this period in a true display of courage in sensitive and difficult circumstances, was now accused of protecting the killers of ʿUthmān by a group of companions, including Muʿāwiya. Not that ʿAlī had not previously criticized ʿUthmān. He questioned his appointments and especially those of his kin who were placed as governors within the state. When ʿAbdullāh b. Saʿd had sent a courtier with the message of the intentions of the rebels, it was ʿAlī whom ʿUthmān sought advice from. He also wanted ʿAlī to meet the rebels. ʿAlī had reminded him that the predicament was caused by his obedience to Marwān and his Umayyad kin, with ʿUthmān concluding that he would now follow ʿAlī's advice. The Muhājirūn were ordered to leave with ʿAlī alongside the Anṣār.[949] It was he who had sent his son al-Ḥasan to defend ʿUthmān in his final days. Caetani dismisses this by stating that al-Ḥasan was not in Medīna, however, Madelung replies by stating that the al-Ḥasan who Caetani is referring to is al-Ḥasan al Baṣrī.[950] This in turn raises the question about Caetani's expertise on the area.

---

[948] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 131-2.
[949] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 2968-9.
[950] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 134.

According to Madelung, Marwān was at the centre of the war of words and he had placed ʿUthmān in a predicament because he was only interested in the future of Umayyad supremacy. ʿUthmān was eventually killed. To Madelung, his downfall was partly his own doing. [951]

In the time of ʿUthmān, Muʿāwiya had a free reign and was given complete control over Shām. It is ironic that history tries to portray a picture that Muʿāwiya was willing to help his cousin when he was facing conflict from all angles. Al-Balādhurī narrates that the third caliph wrote to Muʿāwiya in the same way that he had written to other governors, asking for help. He stated that the people of Medīna had resorted to infidelity and have violated their allegiance. 'Let the warriors of Shām mount any kind of animal, and dispatch them to my aid'. Muʿāwiya is known not to have shown any sense of urgency at all. ʿUthmān is even narrated to have written to the people of Shām, asking them to leave Shām and come to help him.[952] Al-Balādhurī says that when ʿUthmān wrote to Muʿāwiya asking for his help, Muʿāwiya sent Yazīd b. Asad al-Qasrī with a group of soldiers towards Medīnah, but ordered that, upon their arrival at Dhī Khushub,[928] they should set up a camp there and proceed no further. Indeed, they halted and did not proceed until ʿUthmān was eventually killed.[954] Juwayrīyah b. Asmā' narrates that Muʿāwiya sent Yazīd b. Asad al-Qasrī with instructions not to move beyond Dhī Khushub. Juwayrīyah states that Muʿāwiya gave the order because

[951] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 135-6.
[952] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1998), vol. 5, 145.
[954] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (published for the first time by the School of Oriental Studies, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, SDF Goitein Univ Press, 1936), vol. 5, 87.

he wanted ʿUthmān killed and therefore he would become the caliph.[955]

ʿAlī was held responsible for the death of ʿUthmān. He knew the killers and he was seen to be their protector. He was fought at the Battle of Jamal and was victorious. The conflict of the Meccan Quraysh was settled in his favour, now he had to subdue Muʿāwiya. Muʿāwiya stayed far away from Jamal. There was no support for his cousin, nor did he ensure that his soldiers stood by the door of ʿUthmān and his wife and defend them. Jamal paved the way to legitimately fight the caliph of the time without being accused of apostacy.

Muʿāwiya and the Battle of Ṣiffīn

Seven months had passed since the accession of ʿAlī to the caliphate, yet there was little to no communication between the caliph and the governor of Syria.[956] The little communication that was made related to letters deposing the governor. Although Muʿāwiya was seen as less of a threat than the more renowned nobles such as ʿĀʾisha, Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr, ʿAlī still had to ensure that he pledged his allegiance and was not causing him difficulties within the state. There are narrations that Muʿāwiya would reply to letters sent by ʿAlī with empty sheets stating, ‘From Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyan to ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib’, although these seem to be made up, with one stating that ʿAlī sent al-Miswar b. Makhramah, a person who never pledged allegiance to ʿAlī and is known not to have left Mecca

[955] Abī Zaid ʿUmar Ibn Shabba b. ʿAbida Zaid al-Nʿmairī, *Tārīkh al-Madīna al-Munawarrah*, ed. Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt (Iran, 1989), 1288-89.
[956] ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, *Nahj al-Balāgha*, ed. Sayyid Sharīf al-Raḍī (Qum: Ansariyan, 1981), Letters 5-9.

throughout the caliphate of ʿAlī.[957]

Two different accounts are offered in relation to ʿAlī's efforts to gain the pledge of obedience from Muʿāwiya. In the first account, al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah seeks to advise ʿAlī to cement the positions of Muʿāwiya and ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar and the governors of other provinces to ensure that he wins their confidence. Once they have pledged their allegiance, then he is free to decide what path to traverse for the future of the state. This report is narrated by Abū Mikhnaf.[958] ʿAjlān, on the other hand, reports that Jarīr b. ʿAbdullāh al-Bajalī was sent by ʿAlī to Muʿāwiya to gain the pledge of allegiance. He was given a letter which made clear to Muʿāwiya that Ṭalḥa b. ʿUbaydullāh and al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām were killed and that the Immigrants and the Helpers now took ʿAlī as their leader. Muʿāwiya, having read the message, was advised by ʿAmr b. al–ʿĀs to gather the Syrians and gain vengeance through fighting ʿAlī.[959] This was the same ʿAmr who, upon hearing that ʿUthmān was murdered, cried out in happiness and relief, 'I am Abū ʿAbdillah, Surely, when I scratch a sore I scrape the scab before it heals'.[960]

Muʿāwiya, after displaying a lack of *shujāʿa* when ʿUthmān was killed, and keenly watching the Battle of the Camel being fought, was now looking to bravely challenge the rule of ʿAlī. He began by promptly writing to ʿAlī's governor in Egypt, Qays b. Saʿd b. ʿUbadah. Knowing that Iraq and Egypt were areas which had to be covered, he ensured that Qays understood that if you 'support us in our affair and if I win, you would govern Kūfah

[957] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 2, 211-12.
[958] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 4, 438-9/1, 3082-3.
[959] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 4, 561-2/1 3254-5.
[960] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5, 74.

and Ba□ra for life and your family would rule □ij□z. Mu□□wiya knew how to bribe personalities and relieve them of the burdens of their principles through seeking worldly gains.[961] The hunger for power could be seen throughout the poetry of the likes of al-Wal□d b. □Uqbah, the habitual drunkard, who insisted that Mu□□wiya fight □Al□.[962] The same al-Wal□d had left □Uthm□n when he needed his help was now rallying Mu□□wiya to raise arms against □Al□:

> By God, Hind will not be your mother if the day passes; without the avenger taking revenge for □Uthm□n.
> Can the slave of the people kill the Lord of his household and you do not kill him? Would your mother were barren!
> Surely if we kill them no one can legitimately retaliate for them, the wheels of fortune have turned on you.[963]

Al-Wal□d even pressured his brother □Um□rah to help avenge the death of □Uthm□n and join Mu□□wiya:

> I have been given □Amr in exchange for □Uthm□n when I lost him, may God judge between a lord and the supporters of □Amr!
> Surely the best of mankind after three is the one slain by the Tuj□b□ who came from Egypt.
> If my thought about my mother's son, □Um□rah, does not deceive me, he will not seek blood-revenge and retailiation.
> He will stay, when the duty of revenge for Ibn □Aff□n is with him, his tent pitched between al-Khawarnaq and al-Qa□r.[964]

Al-Faḍl b. □Abb□s replies to al-Wal□d, highlighting the belief

---

[961] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 4, 444/1, 3089-91.
[962] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 4, 564/1, 3258.
[963] *Kit□b al-Agh□n□*, vol. 4, 177, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 184-5.
[964] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 3064, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Mu□ammad,* 185.

of ʿAlī's followers in him being the true successor and representative of Muḥammad:

> Do you claim a revenge of which you are not worthy, nor does it belong to you?
>
> Where does the son of Dhakwān, the barbarian slave from ʿaffārīyya stand in relation to ʿAmr?
>
> Just like the daughter of the ass who attaches herself to her mother and forgets her father when she vies for superiority with the glorious.
>
> Surely, the best of mankind after Muḥammad is the legatee of the Prophet al-Muṣṭafa among those who take note,
>
> The first one who prayed and the brother of his Prophet, the first to fell the misguided at Badr.
>
> If the Helpers had seen that your cousin was wronged they would readily have helped him against being wronged.
>
> Sufficient blemish is that they should beckon to kill and would surrender him to the black hordes from Egypt.[965]

ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, who had been angered by ʿUthmān's decision to dismiss him from Egypt, now could see a return within sight. Muʿāwiya knew that ʿAmr was astute, wise and an experienced campaigner. They began to co-operate with one another with ʿAmr raising the cry:

> Muʿāwiya, do not close your eyes, rise in the stirrup of the matter, act equitably or resign, there is no third choice.
> Will you undertake the grand matter and grasp the forelocks of opportunity in these hideous times?[966]

ʿAmr wanted Egypt, Muʿāwiya wanted to rule the state and

---

[965] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 3065, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 186.
[966] Ibn Asākir, *ʿUthmān*, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 308.

maintain his firm grip on Syria, away from the clutches and plans of ʿAlī. To Madelung, Muʿāwiya did not have any intention of using the death of ʿUthmān except as a smokescreen for holding onto Syria:

> He wanted at this stage above all to hold on to the rule of Syria. ʿUthmān had meant little to him, he had done nothing to aid him, and felt no personal obligation to seek revenge. Yet he immediately sensed the political utility of a claim for revenge for the blood of the wronged caliph, as long as he, Muʿāwiya, could decide on whom to pin the blame.[967]

Once again, al-Walīd pins the blame of the mishaps on ʿAlī:

> The companion of ʿUthmān who beckoned to kill him, while his scorpions kept crawling to us every day.
> Don't you see how ʿAlī today is showing off his excuses, while inside him lies concealed the crimes he perpetrated?
> The ones who please me are Kaʿb, Zayd b. Thābit, ʿalqa, and al-Nuʿmān, may his withers not be cut!
> They restrained whoever of them blamed ʿUthmān, and the most blameworthy among the sons of whatever mothers is he who blames him.[968]

Muʿāwiya eventually decided to reject ʿAlī's advances and messengers as well; and defiantly stated in the Mosque that:

> God has made the Holy Land the home of the prophets and His righteous worshippers; He had made the people of Syria dwell there because by his foreknowledge He knew their obedience and their sincerity to his vicegerents and executors of His

[967] Madelung, *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 186.
[968] Ibn ʿAsākir, *ʿUthmān*, 552-3, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Muḥammad,* 189.

> commandment; He had made them a model of order for the Community, signposts on the path of everything good, through whom God restrained the disloyal and united the faithful. 'O God', he prayed, 'support us against a people who awaken our sleepers, frighten those of us who feel safe, want to shed our blood, and to make our path insecure. God knows that we did not want to chastise them, nor to rip apart their screens, nor to make them tread on slippery ground. God, the praiseworthy, has however, dressed us in a cloth of nobility which we shall not take off voluntarily as long as an echo resounds, dew drops, and right guidance is recognized. Only rebelliousness and envy has induced them to oppose us, thus we ask God for help against them.' You know that I am the vicegerent unto you of the Commander of the Faithful ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, that I am the vicegerent of the Commander of the Faithful ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān, that I have never let anyone of you stand in a position of disgrace, and that I am the next of kin of ʿUthmān, who has been killed wrongfully. Yet God says: 'If anyone is killed wrongfully, We give his next of kin authority, but let him not be extravagant in killing, surely he is being helped' (Qurʾān 37:33). I would like you to let me know what is in your hearts about the murder of ʿUthmān.[969]

The Syrians all replied by pledging allegiance to their governor. It was after this speech that ʿAmr joined Muʿāwiya with the agreement being that Egypt would be given to him to rule when Muʿāwiya achieved victory as ruler.[970]

Minqarī, however, narrates that Jarīr was personally visited by Muʿāwiya, who offered a solution to the problem within the state. He would pledge allegiance on the basis that Syria and Egypt, and their respective revenues, would be given to

[969] Al-Minqarī, *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn*, 31-2, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 195.
[970] Al-Minqarī, *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn*, 39-40.

Mu□□wiya.[971] This visit, as Madelung states, could not be made public:

> Mu□□wiya's personal visit to Jar□r was motivated by the need to keep his initiative strictly secret. Had his offer to □Al□ become known to the public, the fraudulence of his claim of revenge for the murdered caliph would have become patent to all and the carefully staged mobilization campaign would have ground to a halt.[972]

Al-Wal□d stifles any chance of Mu□□wiya being tempted into such an agreement:

> Mu□□wiya, surely Syria is your Syria, so hold on to your Syria, do not let the snakes come in to you,
> And protect her with legions and lances, do not be faint with dried up forearms.
> Surely, □Al□ is watching what you will answer him, so present him with a war that will turn the forelocks hoary.
> If not, make peace, certainly in peace there is repose for him who does not desire war, so choose, Mu□□wiya!
> Surely, a letter which you, Ibn □arb, have written out of greed will drive disasters towards you.
> You have asked □Al□ in it what you will not obtain, and if you obtained it, it would last only some nights.
> You would face from him that after which there is no survival, so do not fill yourself with hopes. Will you strike the like of □Al□ with a ruse? Sufficient is what you have tasted before.
> Were his claws once to cling to you, he would deal out to you, Ibn Hind, what you have been dealing out.[973]

---

[971] Al-Minq□r□, *Waq'at □iff□n*, 52.
[972] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 203.
[973] Al-Minq□r□, *Waq'at □iff□n*, 58, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 204.

ʿAlī rejected his offer, and so the call for war was now made by ʿAmr and Muʿāwiya and a declaration was sent to ʿAlī, stating:

> By my life, if the people were pledging allegiance to you and you were innocent of the blood of ʿUthmān you would be like Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān, may God be pleased with them all. But you incited the Muhājirūn against ʿUthmān and induced the Anṣār to desert him, so the ignorant obeyed you and the feeble became strong through you. The people of Syria accept nothing but to fight you until you surrender to them the killers of ʿUthmān.[974]

ʿAlī replied by distancing himself from the killing of ʿUthmān and promising to find the killers in system of justice and an attitude of respect and patience:

> As for your statement: Hand over the killers of ʿUthmān, what are you in relation to ʿUthmān? You are merely a man of Banū Umayyah, and the sons of ʿUthmān are more entitled to that than you. But if you claim that you are more powerful than they to seek retaliation for the blood of ʿUthmān, enter under my obedience and then bring people before me for judgement, and I shall put you and them on the road to justice.[975]

The hesitancy displayed by Muʿāwiya in the lead up to the Battle of Ṣiffīn raises a question concerning his supposed *shujāʿa* as a commander. He had heard of the numbers within the army of ʿAlī and began to plead with soldiers to join him. ʿAmr began to rouse the troops and when al-Walīd heard of the fear affecting Muʿāwiya, he passionately stated:

---

[974] Al-Minqārī, *Waq'at Ṣiffīn*, 57-61, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 205.
[975] Al-Minqārī, *Waq'at Ṣiffīn*, 57-61, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Muḥammad*, 206.

> Inform Mu□□wiya ibn □arb; You surely are blamed by a trustworthy brother.
> You have spent the time like a confined camel stallion in lust, braying in Damascus, but do not move.
> Surely, you and your letter-writing to □Al□ are like a woman tanner whose hide is worm-eaten.
> Every mounted troop gives you hope for the caliphate as it hits hard the ground towards the ruin of Iraq.
> The fellow of blood revenge is not one who hesitates, rather the seeker of vengeance is the brute.
> If you were the slain, and he were alive, he would bare his sword, neither lax nor averse, nor shrinking from blood crimes, even confessing them, nor tiring or sitting still.
> Your people have been destroyed in Med□na, and are lying felled as if they were dry stalks.[976]

Mu□□wiya felt discomfort on a number of occasions. The first occasion was when he was a witness to □Al□'s soldiers, thirsty for a day and a night, regaining control of the Euphrates from Ab□ al-A□war and his men. □Amr had avised Mu□□wiya to let them drink from the water but Mu□□wiya rejected his recommendations and favoured al-Wal□d's advice which emphasised a reminder of the way they supposedly prevented □Uthm□n from obtaining water. The sight of al-Ashtar killing members of Mu□□wiya's army frightened a man who was supposedly the bravest of commanders.[977] Mu□□wiya sought to gain ascendancy within the daily skirmishes up until Dh□l □ijjah. The renowned Sahm b. Ab□ al-Ayz□r of the Ban□ Z□rah of Azd was asked by Mu□□wiya to fight al-Ashtar and was defeated by al-Ashtar. The early skirmishes were frustrating Mu□□wiya. His frustration reached a point where he admitted that if he had the chance, he would kill □Ammar b. Yas□r, putting

[976] Al-□abar□, vol. 1, 3257-8, tr. by Madelung in *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 220-1.
[977] Al-Minq□r□, *Waq'at □iff□n*, 174.

aside the Prophetic statement that ‘Ammar will be killed by infidels’.[978]

This lack of personal courage was looked down upon by the Arabs and was seen in the character of Mu□□wiya at □iff□n. It was not only Mu□□wiya who displays a lack of bravery in seeking revenge for his cousin’s death. Marw□n, when asked by Mu□□wiya to lead the troops of Kal□□ and Ya□s□b against al-Ashtar, is seemingly more interested in what □Amr is being paid and how □Amr is being rewarded than engaging in an act of vengeance for the death of a blood brother. However, □Al□ b. Ab□ □□lib was a man with a storied and revered past in the battlefield and his *shuj□□a* was never questioned. When one of Mu□□wiya’ soldiers eventually challenges □Al□ to a duel, □Urwah b. D□w□d al-Dimashq□ of Ban□ □□m□r, he was completely annihilated by □Al□’s sword.

□Amr b. al-□□s, seeing the number of casualities and surmising that defeat was imminent, decided to raise the Qur□□n on a spear in order to engage in an arbitration based on the teachings of the Qur□□n. This may be seen as an act of political finesse, while to others it was an act of was cowardice. Mu□□wiya’s courage was already questioned within the battle due to the fact that he would remain in hiding far away from the movements within the battle itself, rejecting the call for a duel from □Al□. Now his only way out was to hang the Qur□□n on a spear and call for arbitration. Martin Hinds offers the explanation that the imminency of an attack from the Persian and Byzantine forces prompted al-Ash□ath b. Qays to ensure that the Muslims were united on all fronts, although this is viewed with suspicion considering he and his son were notorious for changing sides:

[978] Al-Minq□r□, *Waq’at □iff□n*, 196-200.

> We may note particularly that al-Ashʿath b. Qays al-Kindī, who did not take part in the battle, is reported by al-Shaʿbī publicly to have expressed fears of attack from the Persians and the Byzantines if these two Arab armies cut each other to pieces: on being informed of this, Muʿāwiya is reprted to have regarded it as representative of the opinion of *dhawī al-aḥlām wa al-nuhā* and to have ordered the attaching of *maṣāḥif* to spearheads.'[979]

He does, however, point out that, according to al-Zuhrī, the principle aim of raising the Qurʾān on spears was to destroy the sense of unity within the ranks of ʿAlī's army. According to Hinds:

> Muʿāwiya was aiming to achieve at the time of the raising of the *maṣāḥif* was to isolate ʿAlī from his Iraqi followers by putting the conflict in a different light, as a senseless conflict between Iraqis and Syrians - senseless because the two parties had similar types of regional interests.[980]

Hinds highlights that caution must be taken when understanding the number of *maṣāḥif* that were raised, for there could only have been a few complete versions of the Qurʾān available at the time to be raised, if that is how they sought to define *muṣḥaf*. Moreover, the *Muṣḥaf Dimashq al-aʿẓam*, which allegedly required ten men to carry it, could surely not have been placed on a spear.[981] ʿAlī had asked a companion of his to raise a *muṣḥaf* at Jamal, but this occurred at the very beginning of the battle to stop the onset of war.[982] ʿAlī's principles for fighting at Jamal never wavered or changed, whereas Muʿāwiya began the Battle of Ṣiffīn seeking vengeance for ʿUthmān's death and then, in an act

[979] M. Hinds, "The Ṣiffīn Arbitration Agreement'', 93.
[980] Hinds, "The Ṣiffīn Arbitration Agreement'', 94-5.
[981] Hinds, "The Ṣiffīn Arbitration Agreement'', 95.
[982] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 3171, 3191.

of cowardice, ensured that the spears were raised to appeal to tribal feelings and emotions.[983] ʿAlī's soldiers, however, were not as loyal as Muʿāwiya's men. Some were clan leaders who simply attended the battle to protect their future interests and when the offer for peace was available they were ready to take it. Others thought that the arbitration would conclude that ʿAlī was the ʾamīr al-Mu'minīn and that Muʿāwiya would pledge his allegiance and return back to Syria. Al-Ṭabarī highlights the fact that ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAbbās believed that Muʿāwiya's men were very much more loyal than the soldiers of ʿAlī. They did not suspect Muʿāwiya's choice of ʿAmr for the arbitration, but were wondering about the letter placed in the hands of ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAbbās. ʿAlī could see that Muʿāwiya's act was not one of *shujāʿa* but of cowardice, deceit and trickery. He was forced to accept Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī as an arbitrator instead of al-Ashtar, because, according to them, 'he warned us against that into which we have fallen'.[984] The cunning ʿAmr was shrewdly chosen by Muʿāwiya.[985] From the outset, ʿAmr made clear that they were not discussing ʿAlī as the ʾamīr al-Mu'minīn but simply as ʿAlī b. Abū Ṭālib since they did not recognize his right of leadership.[986]

After deliberating over who should be caliph, and mentioning the likes of ʿAbdullāh b. ʿUmar and ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, Abū Mūsā decided that they should dismiss the candidacy of both ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya. A public announcement was to be made. Abū Mūsā announced he had abandoned ʿAlī and ʿAmr announced his confirmation that Muʿāwiya b. Abū Sufyān was the caliph of the

[983] Petersen, in *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, discusses who raised the spear between ʿAmr and Muʿāwiya.
[984] Hinds, "The ʿiffīn Arbitration Agreement'', 99.
[985] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 5, 48-9/1 , 3230.
[986] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 3335.

Muslim community.[987] Ibn ʿAbbās believed that in an act of war-time deceit, Muʿāwiya ‘s fortunes changed.[988]

Al-Ṭabarī’s account of the fighting and the subsequent arbitration at Ṣiffīn may be seen as being very long and confusing. This is clearly evident when examining the first part of this section, which discusses the fighting until the summons was issued for arbitration to take place. The incidents are reported in such a haphazard way that one assumes the authorities transmitting the material could not bring any order to it themselves.[989] Wellhausen notes that the names of the soldiers vary. However, the presentation is so similar that the account of the battles narrated at the beginning are the same as those presented after Muḥarram and the truce.[990] While this theory may be appealing, it raises the question as to whether some of the material was later tampered with. Reports are written in a manner similar to the *Ayyām* literature, where the personal exploits of individuals and clans are celebrated in both prose and verse. The *Akhbār* are similar, with changes only occurring with names. When examining each *khabar*, an individual is narrated to exhort his people to fight for God, for their faith and for seeking the truth and concludes by quoting verses from the Qurʾān as a proof for their stand. One example that can be mentioned is that of Ibn Budayl:

> Ibn Budayl stood among his men and said, ‘Muʿāwiya has claimed for his people what they are not, and the man who is unlike him has contested this matter. They “dispute with falsehood, that they might rebut thereby the truth”.

[987] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 5, 70-1/1, 3358-9.
[988] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 4, 441/1, 3086.
[989] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 3256-3329.
[990] Wellhausen, *The Arab Kingdom and Its Fall*, 79.

> (18:54) He has assaulted you with nomadic Arabs and groups whom he had adorned with falsehood, in whose hearts he has sown the seeds of *fitnah*, and whom he has confused concerning this matter. It has "added to their abomination". (9:126) You have from your Lord a light and a clear proof. Fight the impious rebels, do not fear them! Why do you fear them, when in your hands is the book of God, pure and Holy! "Are you afraid of them? You would do better to be afraid of God, if you are a believer. Fight them, and God will chastise them at your hands and degrade them, and He will help you against them, and bring healing to the breasts of a people who believe". (9:13-14) We will fight them first with the Prophet, and secondly with this; for by God!, they do not fear him, nor are they righteous or rightly guided, but only rise to be your enemies. May God bless you'.[991]

The second part of al-Ṭabarī's account is not as confused, and deals with the arbitration, the meeting of the arbitrators and the Khawārij and ʿAlī,[992] yet there remain instances of chronological confusion.[993] Al-Ṭabarī relies greatly on Abū Mikhnaf for his account, and although an analysis of the *isnāds* makes it somewhat difficult to conclude, he most probably used Abū Mikhnaf through a chain of Hishām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī. Does al-Ṭabarī therefore provide an Iraqi version of events? There is not much known about the life of Abū Mikhnaf, a person who is often identified with the Shīʿī historical tradition. Petersen rejects Abū Mikhnaf's chronology. He does this on the basis of

[991] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 3289-3290.
[992] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 3329-3363.
[993] See al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 3341-3343, and the use of al-Zuhrī's *Khabar*, which is seemingly out of place and may indicate al-Ṭabarī losing sight of the proceedings.

certain incidents which have been omitted, particularly ʿAlī's sending Jarīr b. ʿAbdallāh to Muʿāwiya to seek reconciliation.[994] However, what Petersen does not consider is that Naṣr b. Muzāḥim uses Abū Mikhnaf as a source through ʿUmar b. Saʿd. Although he mentions Abū Mikhnaf very rarely by name, a comparison of the *akhbār* and the *isnāds* in his *Tārīkh* makes this point clear.[995] The *khabar* concerning Jarīr b. ʿAbdullāh is narrated by Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, with an *isnād* that gives an indication that it came from Abū Mikhnaf through ʿUmar b. Saʿd.[996] Taking into account that Abū Mikhnaf is used by Naṣr without being named, one may examine an incident where there is a deliberate change of dates. Al-Ṭabarī narrates an account where ʿAlī sends envoys to Muʿāwiya seeking to make peace. The *khabar* twice mentions the date as Dhū-l-ḥijjah after the fighting at Ṣiffīn.[997] The same account, narrated in a very similar way, appears in Naṣr b. Muzāḥim through ʿUmar b. Saʿd, however with the exception being that the date is given as Rabīʿ al-Thānī, eight months earlier. The *khabar* itself mentions ʿAlī's envoys, something not done previously. Furthermore, Abū Mikhnaf dates the breach between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya as being just after his appointment as caliph,[998] and this would therefore mean that ʿAlī had sought reconciliation at a very early period of his leadership. This *khabar* could possibly have been misplaced in the hostilities of Ṣiffīn, with Naṣr b. Muzāḥim having died sixty years after Abū Mikhnaf. Furthermore, the two incidents may be confused and placed together for the first few words in Naṣr b. Muzāḥim are identical to al-Ṭabarī in the manner in which the *khabar* begins. Therefore, it was either Hishām al-Kalbī or al-Ṭabarī who

[994] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 55-57.
[995] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 101-108; see also al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, ed. A. Sprenger/new ed. Maḥmud Ramyar (Mashhad, 1351), 148.
[996] Al-Minqārī, *Waq'at Ṣiffīn,* ed. A.S.M. Hārūn (Cairo, 1365 AH), 32.
[997] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 3270; 3272.
[998] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 56.

changed the date in order to bring chronological order to the *akhbār*. Al-Ṭabarī may ensure that the change took place as in the previous section. He narrates that the breach between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya took place just after the Battle of the Camel.[999] Moreover, the story of ʿUthmān's blood-stained shirt being in the hands of Muʿāwiya is also not included by al-Ṭabarī, in contrast to other sources, as it would affect his carefully planned dating system.[1000]

Al-Ṭabarī insists on this point of a later breach for a number of reasons. First, this would highlight that Muʿāwiya was holding out for some reason, watching the developments occurring in ʿAlī's early days as leader. Muʿāwiya possibly believed that ʿĀ*ʾ*isha, Ṭalḥa and Zubayr were as much to blame for ʿUthmān's death as ʿAlī. He sat back and waited for the results of the conflict, and the worst outcome was that they would present a united front against him and that he was secure in his government and supported by a healthy military. However, he does not portray Muʿāwiya as a man leading a rebellion, and barring the odd *khabar* concerning personal attacks by rival groups, such as ʿAlī's statement that Muʿāwiya and his father were unwilling to convert to Islam and had been seeking to undermine the religion ever since,[1001] there is little in the section which can be construed as condemnatory of Muʿāwiya's leadership. It is ʿAmr who is portrayed as the villain, as the crafty general and

[999] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 3255-3256.
[1000] Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, ed. Naẓr al-Hurīnī, 20 vols. (Bulāq, 1868), vol. 15, 71-72.
[1001] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 1, 3278-3279; Interestingly, Petersen, in*ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 59-61, seeks to prove from this incident that Abū Mikhnaf saw the Umayyad caliphate as being illegal. However, Abū Mikhnaf blames ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ for the arbitration and Muʿāwiya simply for agreeing to it. Abū Mikhnaf should have really attacked Muʿāwiya if he had truly held anti-Umayyad sentiments.

as the instigator behind the rebellion, not Mu□□wiya.[1002]

Al-□abar□'s narrative concerning □iff□n is aimed more at discussing □Al□ and his supporters rather than the Syrians. However, while he shows great respect for □Al□, he does not exaggerate his position. An example may be the deletion of □Al□'s name in the arbitration, which al-□abar□ simply portrays as a reflection of what Mu□ammad had to face at al-□udayb□yyah. Whether the similarity between truth and falsehood is also reflected is open to question. □Al□ is magnanimous, a man who sought peace, who is willing to release the captives of □iff□n, and a man who engages with the people in the street to seek public opinion.[1003] □Al□ only agrees to the arbitration to defend the grandsons of the Prophet, and this can be seen as a defense for his action.[1004] Al-□abar□ sought to defend □Al□'s credibility as caliph and protector of Mu□ammad's *ummah*. The *ummah* was always foremost in importance for al-□abar□ and its leader was to be protected.

While Petersen seeks to portray al-□abar□ as anti-Umayyad, pro-□Abb□sid and pro-Sh□'□, this opinion has to be rejected considering he does not condemn the Umayyad caliphate, and certainly does not believe it was an illegal usurpation of power. The respect given to □Abdull□h b. □Abb□s is nothing but to highlight his trusted role in the eyes of □Al□.[1005] Al-□abar□'s respect to □Al□ is because he is viewed as being of the rightly guided caliphs and not because of any Sh□□i sentiments. To state that, because the Ism□□□l□s were openly active, and therefore influenced his opinions, is to degrade al-□abar□'s stature and

[1002] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 3334-3335.
[1003] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 3349-3363.
[1004] Al-Tabari, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 3346-3347.
[1005] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh,* vol. 1, 3350-3354.

honour.[1006] To al-Ṭabarī, the civil war between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya highlighted the evolution of the early Muslim community and the development of their political allegiances. Allegiances to a cause or an individual may have been seen as dangerous to the unity of the *ummah* by al-Ṭabarī, especially when considering his conservative political and religious background. Ṣiffīn was an incident which he argued had to be studied in order that parallels for his time and his *ummah* could be drawn and learnt from.

A major portion of al-Dīnawarī's *Akhbār* relates the events of the Battle of Ṣiffīn and sheds light on Muʿāwiya's leadership. The longest section of the book, exactly one-fifth, is devoted to ʿAlī's caliphate, while one third of the work is devoted to narrating the conflict at Ṣiffīn and the arbitration agreement.[1007] This highlights the great importance which al-Dīnawarī attached to the event. Al-Dīnawarī would discuss the Eastern provinces in much of his work, and the fact that Shīʿī sympathies were growing in this area may imply that he was sympathetic to the ʿAlīd cause. The general line of al-Ṭabarī's *Tārīkh* is followed by al-Dīnawarī, with al-Ṭabarī using Abū Mikhnaf as his chief authority, and al-Dīnawarī using Naṣr b. Muzaḥim, who also relied on Abū Mikhnaf.[1008]

[1006] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 149-158 – This view of Petersen stems from his rejection of Abū Mikhnaf.

[1007] Abū Ḥanīfah Aḥmad b. Dāwūd al-Dīnawarī, *Kitāb al-Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, ed. V. Guirgass (Leiden, 1888). Preface, Variantes et Index, Ignas Kratchkovsky (Leiden, 1912), 178-215.

[1008] Petersen's statements have to be examined in light of this point, as Naṣr b. Muzāḥim is known to have extensively used Abū Mikhnaf. He argued that al-Dīnawarī may have used Abū Mikhnaf through the intermediary of Hishām al-Kalbī, which is possible considering al-Ṭabarī and Naṣr b. Muzāḥim were using two different versions of Abū Mikhnaf, but are in agreement to the extent that there are a number of verbatim quotations from earlier sources. Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, 161-162.

Where there is a difference between the two is that al-Dīnawarī combines the *akhbār* into a continuous narrative, the material is systematized and presented more coherently. In contrast to al-Ṭabarī, there is a list of the commanders in each army as well as a description of the topography of the Euphrates River at Ṣiffīn, which helps portray the initial conflict and fight for access to the water.[1009] Furthermore, the fraternization between members of both armies is reported, and al-Dīnawarī portrays their hope for reconciliation.[1010] There is agreement for both sides, and ʿAmr's rasing of the *maṣāḥif* is perceived as being less deceitful.[1011] The arbitration is narrated from Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, which is seen having a pro-ʿAlī slant. Petersen describes how al-Dīnawarī 'chooses here quite logically the Shīʿī one'.[1012] However, what is meant by the term 'logically' is quite confusing. A person may have admiration for ʿAlī but may not necessarily subscribe to what was later known as the Shīʿī sect. Furthermore, Hinds points to the fact that the version of the agreement used by al-Dīnawarī is possibly a pro-ʿAlid elaboration of what was reported in earlier works.[1013] To al-Dīnawarī, ʿAlī is one of the rightly guided caliphs and is venerated as a leader democratically chosen by the community of believers.[1014]

Yaʿqūbī is viewed as 'the other outstanding Shīʿitizing writer of the ninth century',[1015] placed next to al-Dīnawarī. Many words of ʿAlī and his descendants are narrated, portraying where his views on authority lay. Only ʿAlī's reign is called *Khilāfah*,

[1009] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, 178-82.
[1010] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, 180.
[1011] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya,* 166.
[1012] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya,* 167.
[1013] Hinds, "The Ṣiffīn Arbitration Agreement'', 93-129.
[1014] Al-Dīnawarī, *Akhbār al-Ṭiwāl*, 149-151.
[1015] Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya,* 169.

with others being entitled *Ayyām*. Sections are devoted to each of the first eight Imāms of the Imāmīs and the tenth under the year of their deaths. The authorities for each *khabar* are rarely indicated, although they are listed in no apparent order in the second part of his *Tārīkh*.[1016]

Therefore, it is argued that al-Yaʿqūbī was portraying an explicitly pro-ʿAlī account, particularly in his narration of the Battle of Ṣiffīn and the arbitration agreement. ʿAlī's army is one which he describes as being full of immigrants and helpers of Mecca and Medīna including those who fought at Badr, in contrast to only two of the Anṣār who fought with Muʿāwiya. ʿAlī's intentions are pure, and so are those of his soldiers, who are seeking to protect the interest of the community of the believers.[1017] Al-Yaqūbī's Muʿāwiya is full of vengeance in contrast to the passive Muʿāwiya depicted by al-Ṭabarī. When ʿAlī seeks to drink from the river, Muʿāwiya is narrated to have angrily replied, 'God did not let me or Abū Sufyān drink from the tank of his messenger'.[1018] While al-Ṭabarī mentions Muʿāwiya as seeking revenge for ʿUthmān, al-Yaʿqūbī portrays Muʿāwiya as a man who simply wanted to cause discord, with ʿAlī seeking peace. It is Muʿāwiya, rather than ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ who is to be blamed for tricking Abū Mūsā at the arbitration.[1019] Not only is al-Ashʿath b. Qays also given a share of the blame, al-Yaʿqūbī minimizes the number of ʿAlī's men who accepted the arbitration as only being the Yemeni troops. ʿAlī is portrayed as being firmly in charge of his soldiers, with many of them trusting him.

[1016] Aḥmad b. Abī Yaʿqūb al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh al-Yaʿqūbī*, 3 vols., ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Baḥr al-ʿUlūm (Najaf, 1384 AH), vol. 2, 3.
[1017] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 177.
[1018] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 177.
[1019] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 178-9.

Al-Ya□q□b□ is therefore seen as a historian whose purpose is more to interpret than to inform, and his combination of the *akhb□r* into a single narrative seeks to achieve this aim. Petersen seeks to portray al-Bal□dhur□, al-Ya□q□b□, al-□abar□ and al-D□nawar□ as seeking to compromise between orthodox and moderate Sh□□□ views. He concludes that they attempt to 'find a compromise that might unite all moderate forces against the radical tendencies'.[1020] This conclusion seems unfounded. Petersen places a great emphasis on the emergence of extremist Sh□'□ groups in this period. The question arises as to why the scholars would seek to find a compromise when crises of a similar nature did not produce such activity. The Kh□rijites would be seen as a great threat in the time of al-Ya□q□b□ and al-D□nawar□, likewise Ismailism in the time of al-□abar□, yet there is no change in their positions because of this political activity.

Even though Mas□□d□ uses Ab□ Mikhnaf, he seeks to provide a logical order to his material. The fight for the river is the only conflict before the truce. The truce continues through Dh□l-□ijjah and Muharram and the skirmishes that occur are in Safar.[1021] Al-Mas□□d□ interestingly describes the great dissension in □Al□'s army[1022] and that al-Ash□ath was ready to accept the Syrian offer for arbitration. Furthermore, his pro-□Al□d inclination may be seen in that he does not mention □Al□ as having been compelled to remove the title '□□m□r al-mu'min□n' from the agreement, as this would place him as an ordinary man and equal to Mu□□wiya. He provides three version of the

[1020] Petersen, *ʿAl□ and Muʿ□wiya*, 169-174.
[1021] □Al□ b. al-□usayn al-Masʿ□d□, *Les Prairies d'Or,* ed. and trans. Barbier de Maynard and Pavet de Courteille, 9 vols. (Paris, 1861-77), vol. 4, 344-378.
[1022] Al-Masʿ□d□, *Mur□j*, vol. 4, 378-90.

arbitration agreement, the first very lengthy and elaborated upon, the second from Abū Mikhnaf and shorter, and the third even shorter.[1023] The first is clearly the narrative preferred by Masʿūdī. ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ is portrayed as being a crafty man and Abū Mūsā as a man full of vanity who is easily tricked. Muʿāwiya is depicted as being power hungry and as a rebel and arch-enemy. He denies ʿAlī access to water, and compels ʿAmr to fight ʿAlī in one-on-one combat. It is Muʿāwiya who advises ʿAmr to be careful before the arbitration meeting; thus implying that the craftiness was imparted to ʿAmr by Muʿāwiya. This cunningness of Muʿāwiya is portrayed in the narrative when Muʿāwiya cleverly makes ʿAmr pledge allegiance to him at a time when ʿAmr was hesitant and ready to go his own way.[1024] Muʿāwiya is the villain and ʿAmr is portrayed as being weak.

ʿAlī on the other hand is the fighter who killed five hundred and twenty three men in one day and night. His fight is for truth and justice and to remove oppression and only the disobedience of his supporters does not allow him to achieve his aim. To al-Masʿūdī, ʿAlī is a man of knowledge, quoting passages of the Qurʾān and poetry. It is his army that is full of revered companions. Where al-Ṭabarī seeks to dumb down the dispute, al-Masʿūdī draws a sharp distinction between the two leaders, leaving the reader to conclude that Muʿāwiya was the villain and ʿAlī was the hero.

Al-Bāqillānī seeks to defend the position of Muʿāwiya when discussing the fatal killing of ʿUthmān. He negates the Shīʿī arguments posed against ʿUthmān's appointment of Muʿāwiya by stating that Muʿāwiya and Marwān b. al-Ḥakam were appointed not because they were ʿUthmān's kinsmen, but rather because they

[1023] Al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 4, 390-402.
[1024] Al-Masʿūdī, *Murūj*, vol. 4, 403-406.

were men of integrity and vigor.[1025] This, he states, was the same Mu□□wiya who was a commander during the entire period of the rule of □Umar b. al-Khatt□b.[1026] However, his opinion seems to change when discussing Mu□□wiya's position in relation to □Al□.

□Al□ is described by al-B□qill□n□ as the 'fourth and the last of the great Im□ms, and the best fitted man for the Im□mate after Ab□ Bakr, Umar and □Uthm□n'.[1027] Al-B□qill□n□ rejects the arguments of those who opposed □Al□, including Mu□□wiya, concerning the killing of □Uthm□n by stating that as an Im□m and caliph he:

> might have his own *ijtih□d* concerning matters of blood and his *ijtih□d* might not involve the killings of anyone to restore order. Therefore, it was permissible for □Al□, and within his sovereign rights, to postpone the punishment of the slayers in order to preserve the unity of the Muslims and to prevent a situation worse than the unjust slaying of □Uthm□n.[1028]

Furthermore, he states that even if the reason given by later leaders of rebellions that □Al□ did not punish the slayers of □Uthm□n was true, that should not constitute a reason to rebel against him and become a means to depose him.[1029] Al-B□qill□n□ praises □Al□'s excellence and precedence virtues, including the fact that he was one of the early believers in the message, and that he was knowledgable by using the Prophetic narration, 'The best Q□□□ among you is □Al□', and that he was a great fighter for the cause of Islam in contrast to Mu□□wiya.[1030] The themes of

[1025] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 224.
[1026] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 224.
[1027] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 227-229.
[1028] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 232.
[1029] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 235-6.
[1030] Al-B□qill□n□, *al-Tam□□d*, 227-228.

ʿilm and *shujāʿa* emerge once again. Interestingly, his exposition of the Imāmate ends with ʿAlī. This may reflect the Asharī belief that there was a shift after this period from caliphate to kingship.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, we have sought to look at the development of the term *shujāʿa* and it's application during Muʿāwiya's leadership. The analysis examined his military conduct as well as his response to ʿUthmān's murder and the events surrounding battle of Siffin. Muʿāwiya's leadership is often described as being successful because of the *shujāʿa* that he displayed in leading the armed forces both on land and sea. A study of these conquests reveals that, in many cases, while being a leader who was tactically astute, his displays on the battlefield or on sea are indeed both questionable and minimal. Not only does he display little interest in standing to defend ʿUthmān when ʿUthmān was ambushed in Medīna, there is also little mention of his personal exploits on sea in attacking the opposition leaders. Indeed, when examining the Battle of Ṣiffīn, one may argue that the height of cowardice was displayed in his unwillingness to confront ʿAlī in one-on-one combat. While these accounts may be viewed as being pro-ʿAlīd, this does not necessarily mean that the historians subscribed to anything but respect for ʿAlī's position rather than subscribing to later Imāmī beliefs. To al-Jāḥiẓ, writing at a time where authority was a major dispute and the merits of the caliph were being argued, there is no discussion of Muʿāwiya's *shujāʿa*. Muʿāwiya's narrated merits do not necessarily prove that he was worthy of being the caliph of the state.

> But we have never met anyone who argued on Mu□□wiya's behalf that he was any more than a man like other Muslims…and the scribe of the Revelation. This latter duty was previously carried out by those whom you know…and it has never been regarded as giving any title to the Im□mate…[1031]

Moreover, contrary to the opinion of al-Taw□□d□, Mu□□wiya's ascension to the throne was simply a matter of good fortune and using his cousin's death to extol his position. To al-J□□i□:

> There is no reason to extol Mu□□wiya for the circumstances that gave him his strength and brought him to power, for that good fortune he owes only to the murderers of □Uthm□n and those who, when the Syrian cried: 'Give us □Uthm□ns' murderers', replied, 'We are all □Uthm□n's murderers'. Had □Uthm□n not been assassinated, Mu□□wiya would not have been able to persuade the common people, the Syrian mob, the guileless, gullible Bedouins, that it was □Al□ who had killed him.[1032]

To al-J□□i□, the arbitration at □iff□n was a victory for □Al□ and a defeat for Mu□□wiya. Al-J□□i□ does not necessarily agree with the text of the agreement, saying that the text of the agreement is forged due to the fact 'the earliest link in the chain is al-Zuhr□ and the soundest authority is Ibn Isḥ□q'.[1033] He describes □Al□ as the trickster and Mu□□wiya as the one tricked.[1034] □Al□ could see that his troops were disunited and that continuing the battle would have resulted in their defeat. To al-J□□i□, □Al□ would never give in to Mu□□wiya, but had to think of a way of regaining the confidence of his troops by making them come together and discuss their position, as any

[1031] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□*, 67.
[1032] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□*, 67.
[1033] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□*, 68-69.
[1034] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□*, 68.

great leader should be able to unite his troops and open avenues of consultation.

> ʿAlī used cunning, while Muʿāwiya hesitated. If the latter had an inkling of the increasing weakness of ʿAlī's position and had attacked him with troops whose heart beat in unison and whose fervor was unanimous, nothing could have prevented his triumph, and that battle would have been the last. ʿAlī realized that his best course was to let Muʿāwiya and his supporters think that he was willing to be put on a footing of equality, and that he acknowledged that their two situations were so similar that the matter needed to be submitted to human scrutiny…I am continually surprised that Muʿāwiya should have agreed to this truce and interval…[1035]

Furthermore, al-Jāḥiẓ refutes the arguments put forward by Muʿāwiya's supporters for his leadership and its legitimacy. Amongst their claims was that he had been appointed by ʿUmar to be a governor and this shows his credibility and that he had to avenge the death of ʿUthmān. Al-Jāḥiẓ replies by first stating that:

> Muʿāwiya never put forward these arguments, and no one in his lifetime put them forward on his behalf, they were not mentioned or even thought of. Some were invented by dialecticians hostile to ʿAlī, or by those who insult the accursed extreme Shīʿa.[1036]

Furthermore, he states:

> If Muʿāwiya had used these arguments, or if anyone else had put any of them forward at the time, the fact would be

[1035] Pellat, *The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ*, 68.
[1036] Pellat, *The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ*, 71.

familiar to traditionists and transmitters renowned for their veracity. You will undoubtedly know that these are not the methods of *ruwāt*, but of dialecticians acting simultaneously as *ruwāt*. You have heard Mu□□wiya's speeches and letters, and the text of the agreement, do you really think it likely that he could have had even a part of these arguments at his disposal and not have used them in his speeches, propogated them, and offered them to his followers for acceptance? On the contrary, he would have lost no time in entering them in a book which would have been read to his troops every Monday and Thursday![1037]

Chapter 7

□Ilm

[1037] Pellat, *The Life and Works of J□□i□*, 72.

When examining the range of classical sources of the 3rd to 6th century, it is evident that the *khalīfah* must be a person of *ʿilm*. Both the Imāmīs[1038] and the Ismāʿīlīs view *ʿilm* as necessary to ensure the guidance of the community of believers in all matters pertaining to one's life, both public and private. [1039] The Muʿtazilites were also of the opinion that the caliph helps guide the believers in their obligations and explains to them how they are to be followed,[1040] an opinion shared by al-Jāḥiẓ in the world of *adab*, who believed in a triumvirate of men of *ʿilm*; the Prophets, the Messengers and the Imāms.[1041] This opinion is also posited in the works of al-Bāqillānī, who cites, amongst the duties of the Imām, the importance of his role as one who ensures that *sharīʿah* is implemented and the punishments are explained[1042] and al-Ashʿarī saw the Imām as the most excellent of the community.[1043] Al-Juwaynī defined the caliph as one who should be the interpreter of Islamic law and a *muftī* in character, one who should be followed rather than be a follower.[1044] Therefore, *ʿilm* in these sources is seen as a condition for leadership, both to disseminate knowledge of religious and secular affairs in the Islamic state. The importance of *ʿilm* as an attribute of leadership will be examined in light of Muʿāwiya's years as both governor and caliph of the Islamic state.

Muʿāwiya viewed himself as God's deputy on earth. Historical narrations indicate his opinion of his role as caliph when he said, 'The earth belongs to God and I am the deputy of God'.[1045]

[1038] Kohlberg, "Imām and Community in the Pre-Ghayba Period", 25.
[1039] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār*, 159, and "Urujuza", tr. in Poonawala, *al-Qadi an-Numan*, 27.
[1040] ʿAbd al-Jabbar, *al-Mughnī*, vol. 20, Part 1, 17.
[1041] Pellat, *The Life and Works of Jāḥiẓ,* 64.
[1042] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Tamhīd*, 185-6.
[1043] Al-Ashʿarī, *Maqālāt al-Islamiyyin*, 151.
[1044] Al-Juwaynī, *al-Ghiyathī*, 91; see also Lapidus, *A History of Islamic Societies,* 84-90.
[1045] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf,* vol. 4A, 17; vol. 4/1, 20.

Furthermore, ʿUrithah b. Badr famously tells Ziyād b. Abīh that 'Your brother, Ibn Ḥarb, is the deputy of God and you are his vizier'.[1046] ʿAṣim b. Sayfī tells Yazīd upon hearing of Muʿāwiya's death that 'You have lost the *Khalīfat Allāh* and been given *Khilāfat Allāh*'.[1047] Yazīd himself, when describing his father, states that 'Muʿāwiya ibn Abī Sufyan was a servant of God whom God deputed (*Istakhlafahu Allāh*) over the servants…and God…has now invested us with what he had'.[1048] Furthermore, poets would describe that how in the character of Muʿāwiya, 'God protected mankind from perdition'.[1049] In viewing himself as God's caliphs on earth, he placed himself alongside the Prophets who God had chosen and in a way can be seen to have assumed their roles. While some believed that 'no caliph assumed religious authority',[1050] many works point to Muʿāwiya, amongst others, viewing themselves as being God's messengers on earth as well as his messengers.[1051] These leaders would require *ʿilm* as a necessity to help lead the members of the religion. When examining the vastness of the word *ʿilm*, we firstly differentiate between Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* as personal experiences handed down by generations and *ʿilm* as knowledge which is used to guide the Muslims in all religious affairs. Secondly, we differentiate between *ʿilm* as an all-encompassing knowledge of religious precepts and *ʿilm* as a type of knowledge where the leader can display the ability to practice self-control. This will clearly be seen in using the inter-textual approach,

---

[1046] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh,* vol. 2, 78.
[1047] Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ, *al-Bayān wa'l-tabyīn*, ed. A.S.M. Harun (Cairo, 1948-50), vol. 2, 191.
[1048] ʿAbdullāh b. Muslim Ibn Qutaybah, *al-Imāmāh wa'l-siyāsah* (Cairo, 1909), 190.
[1049] Al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī* (Cairo, 1927-74), vol. 12, 74.
[1050] C. A. Nallino, "Appunti sulla natura del 'Califatto' in genere e sul presunto 'Califatto ottomano'", in his *Raccolta di scritti editi e inediti*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1941) as cited in *God's Caliph*, 1.
[1051] From E. Tyan, *Histoire de l'organisation judiciare en pays d'Islam* (Paris, 1938-1943; 2nd edition, Leiden, 1960) in *God's Caliph*, refs. cited on 6-7.

including the genre of jurisprudence. Importantly, his interaction with prominent figures in his leadership indicates a lack of *ʿilm* in central Islamic precepts, beliefs and tenants.

Introduction to *ʿIlm*

ʿIlm[1052] is sometimes wrongly translated simply as knowledge. One can indeed see a difference between the two terms which then creates a need for an expanded definition. Knowledge is defined as being 'all that a person knows' and 'all that is known' whereas *ʿilm* is derived from the verb 'to know'. *ʿAlʿma*, the root, is rendered from the verbal matter 'to know.' Its origin in the Arabic language is discussed by Rosenthal and is contrasted with the idea of *jahl* when he states, 'Corroborative evidence for such an origin of Arabic ʿ-l-m "to know" may be found in one of the roots expressing the opposite idea, namely j-h-l "to be ignorant"'.

Originally, *ʿilm* was viewed as 'a generalised abstract term unconnected with crude material data'.[1053] In pre-Islamic Arabia, amongst the definitions of 'one who knows' was that of the poet, as Arab lexicographers define *shiʿr* as poetry. They would view *shiʿr* as metrical speech. The term became specialised in this meaning because of the noble character of such speech which was gained through meter and rhyme, even if any knowledge may be called *shiʿr*, in the same manner in which the term *fiqh*, meaning knowledge and understanding, had the specialized meaning of the science of religious law.[1054] The poet could handle data which was

[1052] al-Isfahʿnʿ, *Kitʿb al-mufradʿt fʿ gharʿb al-Qurʿn*, 343.
[1053] F. A. Rosenthal, *Knowledge Trimuphant: The Concept of Knowledge in Medieval Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 12.
[1054] Muḥammad b. Mukarram Ibn Manẓʿr, *Lisʿn al-ʿArab*, 20 vols. (Cairo: Bʿlaq, 1300-108 AH), vol. 6, 76.

beyond that of normal practical experiences. He had the gift of insight and the ability to express this insight. At this stage of its development, *□ilm* was not linked to any scholarly pursuits. The poets' 'primary concern was the realm of the senses and its sublimation not into intellectual abstractions but into purer forms of sensual enjoyment'.[1055]

The poetry of this period indicates that the Arabs saw *□ilm* as gradated, which has to be acquired, possesses intrinsic value, and has its circumscribed limits. Knowledge is something that sets the individual apart from his fellow men.[1056] This can be seen in the words of al-N□bigha al-Dhuby□n□, 'He who is ignorant of something is not like the one who knows'.[1057] To overcome ignorance, the individual must gather a great amount of information in a certain period of time. □arafah's *Mu'allaqah* states that 'the days will show you what you are ignorant of, and someone for whom you did not provide as your messenger will bring you the news'.[1058] Knowledge was defined in terms of gaining more experience and searching for lessons from these experiences. □□*□*isha Jillan states in her verse that 'if you desire knowledge or the like or someone present giving information about someone absent, probe the earth with all its objects and probe companions with companion!'[1059] Humans cannot access all knowledge; there is a certain amount which can only be accessed by an omniscient diety. As Zuhayr's *Mu□allaqah* states, 'You should not conceal from God what is in your minds, In the hope that it will remain secret. Whatever may be

[1055] Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant*, 14.
[1056] Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant*, 14.
[1057] W. Ahlwardt, *The Divans of the Six Ancient Arabic Poets*, 25, no. 23:11 (London, 1870).
[1058] Ahlwardt, *Six Ancient Arabic Poets*, 60, no. 4
[1059] R. Geyer, *The Divan of al-□□□isha* (London, E.J.W. Gibb Memorial series, N.S.6, 1928), 276.

concealed from God, He knows'.[1060] There is a debate as to whether the idea of such a diety was well known to Arabs in pre-Islamic times or if there was an Islamic influence upon these lines.[1061]

Izutsu defines *ʿilm* in terms of both its basic and relational meaning. The basic meaning is simply to know something about something, whereas the relational meaning refers to a knowledge by acquaintance.[1062] The word *ʿilm* is viewed as having the same meaning whether it is discussed in the context of pre-Islamic poetry, the Qurʾān and theology in its basic meaning rather than its relational meaning. The difference, according to Izutsu, refers to where the *ʿilm* is derived. In pre-Islamic Arabia, *ʿilm* referred to knowledge gained through personal experience. Subjective thinking was viewed as groundless and unreliable whereas that of experience was viewed as reliable. There is therefore a distinction made between *ẓann*, which is seen as the subjective thinking process, and *ʿilm*, the process of knowledge gained through personal experience. This is highlighted in the poetry of ʿarafah when he states, 'I know through experience that when a near cousin of a man has been allowed to fall into a humiliating situation, that would mean no other thing than that he himself has fallen into such a situation'. ʿarafah emphasizes that he has had experience of this happening, rather than from 'a piece of groundless thinking with no objective guarantee to support it'.[1063]

ʿIlm, therefore, in tribal tradition, was a form of knowledge

[1060] Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant,* 15.
[1061] See also S. Stetkevych, *The Mute Immortals Speak.*
[1062] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qurʾān,* 59.
[1063] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qurʾān,* 59; see also A.J. Arberry, *Arabic Poetry: A Primer for Students* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1965) and Jaroslav Stetkevych, *Arabic Poetry and Orientalism* (Oxford: St John's College Research Centre, 2004).

which was handed down from generation to generation and rubber stamped with approval by the tribal authorities.[1064] Different people conveyed their personal experiences which would in turn prove to be tribal assets accumulated through different generations. Indeed, the Arabs would view such knowledge as an asset and would protect it in the form of proverbs, which would then be propagated within their circles. This knowledge would subsequently be given added strength by the poets whose used such wisdom in their artistic expressions that they recited amongst the community. However, when one examines *ʿilm* in light of the Qurʾān, the source of the *ʿilm* under question changes - although *ʿilm* and *ẓann* remain on opposite ends of the discussion. The *ʿilm* which had its grounding in tribal protection throughout the generations in pre-Islamic Arabia was now replaced by the Qurʾān. It was seen as a pure source of *ʿilm*, while being objective at the same time.

ʿIlm now is defined as that knowledge which comes from a Divine source, it is the truth that emanates from God. This source is viewed as being absolutely reliable, whereas all other sources are now seemingly invalid and unreliable. Indeed, even the knowledge revered in *jāhilīyyah* is now 'degraded to the lower degree of *ẓann*'.[1065] It's as if the Qurʾān looks at certain parts of the *ʿilm* which was gained in the *jāhilīyyah* period with disgust, as nothing more than conjecture. It is as if the Qurʾān also wanted *ʿilm* to be accessed by all classes in Arabian society and not just a certain tribe, clan or class. Tribes which had protected years of disbelief in God and the Hereafter were now told, 'Of that they have no knowledge (*ʿilm*). They are

[1064] Knowledge formed in tradition, akin to MacIntyre's ideas about ethics, see Alasdair MacIntyre, *A History of Ethics* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967).
[1065] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qurʾān*, 60.

merely conjecturing'.[1066] The human being is viewed as being impulsive and at times reckless in its behaviour, and therefore the knowledge which is grounded on such a character has to be guided. *ʿIlm* is sometimes juxtaposed with the word *hawā*, which refers to this impulsive behaviour that does not lead to solid grounding in the knowledge of the affairs of the world. 'Nay, but those who do evil follow their own caprices, without knowledge'.[1067] Instead of following divine guidance, the disbelievers are following a form of *ʿilm* that is invalid and leads to nothing but blindness and to being astray.

Even the Prophet is severely warned that the real *ʿilm* is that which emanates from the Divine sources, and that if he were to follow the *hawā* of those who surrounded him, then the heavens would cease to show any support to his message, because the message would now be one based on both recklessness and knowledge from a questionable source. 'If you should follow their caprices (*ahwāʾa*), after the knowledge (*ʿilm*) that has come to you, then you would have no protector against God nor any defender'.[1068] Interestingly, the Qurʾān refers to a group of people who are known as the *rāsikhūna fī al-ʿilmā*, those who are firmly rooted in knowledge. This group have firmly grounded *ʿilm* with knowledge of the secrets of creation as well as the text of the Qurʾān. Such people are revered as the guides of the community. Their knowledge of religious affairs emanates from Divine teachings and is a solid source rather than which is one based on conjecture alone. This group, to the Imāmīs, are viewed as the progeny of Muḥammad hence the Imāmī belief in them as protectors of the revealed *ʿilm*. This is discussed by Rosenthal

[1066] Qurʾān 45:23-4.
[1067] Qurʾān 30:28-9.
[1068] Qurʾān 13:37.

where he states, ‘important, however, is the obvious assumption throughout the Qur□□n that human knowledge, that is, true human knowledge, is to be equated with religious insight. In this connection, it is worthy to notice that *□ilm* is supposed to have been possessed, preferably by biblical figures, who succeeded in achieving knowledge of the true religion. Indeed, the prophets are in the possession of a knowledge coming to them from God such as ordinary human beings do not possess’.[1069]

Theologically, the fundamental semantic structure of the term *□ilm* experiences no change, but the absolutely reliable and firmly grounded source is now enlarged to include the words, actions and tacit approval of the Prophet Mu□ammad. The *sunnah* is placed alongside the Qur□□n, ‘the traditions of the prophet have established their claim to rank with the Qur□□n as another real source of *□ilm*’.[1070] While the Qur□□n is now accepted as the primary source in the Muslim world, the *sunnah* is now at a level where it is ‘capable of furnishing human knowledge with something like super human validity’.[1071] Rosenthal states:

> In the Prophet’s view of the world, “knowledge’’ which in its totality is a matter of the deepest concern for him consists of two principal parts. There is human knowledge, that is, a secular human knowledge of an elementary or more advanced character and a religious human knowledge; the latter constitutes the highest development of knowledge attainable to man, and is the kind of human knowledge usually meant in the Qur□□n where it preaches the importance of human knowledge. But in addition to human knowledge both secular and religious, there also a exists a divine knowledge. It is basically identical with human knowledge, still

[1069] Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant,* 29.
[1070] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 62
[1071] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 62.

> it is somehow of a higher order both quantatively and qualitatively. The most important feature of these aspects of knowledge is that they are felt and represented by the Prophet as interlocking and interdependent. There can be no human knowledge, secular or religious, without the knowledge possessed by the deity.[1072]

Theologically, *ʿilm* as firmly grounded knowledge is that which emanates from God and is passed to the Prophet. Certainty is ascertained through examination of the reliability of the chains of the narrators that would later lead to the Prophet himself, but the ultimate exemplar to build upon in searching for *ʿilm* was the Prophet. The caliph who therefore claimed to be God's deputy on earth would not only require a knowledge of the customs of the tribes of Arabia and their lore of preserved personal experience, but more importantly, would have to take the mantle of guiding people through knowledge of the Qurʾān and the traditions of the Prophet Muḥammad. The Imāms would state that the leader is divinely inspired, a *muḥaddath*.[1073] His knowledge is received immediately and is not acquired. In this way, he is not a legislator but simply has the knowledge to interpret and protect legislation.[1074] This is discussed by Rosenthal:

> Religious knowledge was, of course, stressed in Islam generally as a qualification for leadership of the Muslim community, but the extraordinary role played by the Shiʿah Imāms led to sometimes extravagant claims for them as depositories of all knowledge natural as well as supernatural. Zaydī exhibits

[1072] Rosenthal, *Knowledge Trimuphant,* 31.
[1073] Kohlberg, "The Term *Muhaddath in Twelver* Shīʿism", *Studio Orientalia D.H. Baneth Dedicata* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979), 39-47.
[1074] See T. Bayhom-Daou, "The Imām's Knowledge and the Qurʾān According to al-Faḍl b. Shādhān al-Nīsābūrī (d. 260 A.H./874 A.D.)", *BSOAS*, 64, 2 (2001), 188-207.

> moderate views also in this respect. The extent of the Zayd□ Im□m's knowledge and independent judgement is in principle limited to the ability of following and evaluating the scholarly discussion.[1075]

Knowledge was therefore viewed as an attribute of the caliph of the Islamic state. Salvation could only be achieved through the caliph. He was viewed as the refuge for the people, guiding them in religious and political affairs. The caliph was a connection between the people and the creator. His knowledge would be vital in ensuring that they were under constant guidance. The Qur□□nic concept of holding fast to God's rope would be emphasized, with God's rope referring to the caliph. Mu□□wiya was viewed as the rope of God, where Yaz□d describes him as *'□abl min □ibl All□h'*.[1076] Furthermore, poets would describe how in the character of Mu□□wiya 'God protected mankind from perdition'.[1077]

The caliphal ideal would be described clearly in the poetry of Jar□r[1078] and al-Farazdaq.[1079] Jar□r would talk of the fact that 'were it not for the caliph and the book he recites, people would have no judgements established for them and no communal worship'.[1080] In the same way the Prophet was seen as *Im□m al-Hud□*, so was the caliph.[1081] Therefore, you had to choose the right Im□m when two were fighting for such a position, as in the

---

[1075] Rosenthal, *Knowledge Triumphant,* 144.

[1076] A□mad b. Mu□ammad Ibn □Abd Rabbih□, *al-□Iqd al-Far□d*, ed. A□mad Am□n, A□mad al-Zayn and Ibr□h□m al-Iby□r□ (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta'lif wa al-Tarjama wa al-Nashr, 1948), vol. 4, 89.

[1077] Al-Isfah□n□, *Kit□b al-Agh□n□* (Cairo, 1927-74), vol. 12, 74.

[1078] Jar□r b. □A□□yya b. al-Kha□af□, *Diw□n*, ed. M.I.A. al-Ṣ□w□ (Cairo 1353) and ed. N.M.A. Ṭ□h□ (Cairo 1969-70).

[1079] Hamm□m b. Gh□lib Ab□ Fir□s al-Farazdaq, *D□w□n*, ed. M.I.A. al-Ṣ□w□ (Cairo, 1936 and Beirut, 1960).

[1080] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph*, 40.

[1081] M. Hinds, "The Banners and the Battle Cries of the Arabs at the Battle of □iff□n (657 AD)", *al-Ab□□th*, 24 (1971); Sebastian P. Brock, "Syriac Views of Emergent Islam" in G.H.A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies in the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1982), 14.

case of ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya. Their issue was not simply a political issue, it was an issue of religious guidance. The Imām's knowledge of the Qurʾān and the traditions was to be used to guide the people.

Indeed, one may argue that the evolution of the word *sunnah* has an important connection to Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm*. The *sunnah*, which originally referred to the actions of the Prophet, his words and his tacit approval would later crystallize to the *sunnah* of the rightly guided caliphs. There is little mention of the *sunnah* of Muʿāwiya,[1082] even though the term had a scope for individuals who succeeded the Prophet to be included, as were Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Crone and Hinds comment on this important point by stating:

> The *sunnah* was not envisaged as a set of concrete rules, but rather as a general example, an *uswa ḥasana* such as that set by the Prophet according to the Qurʾān. When the Umayyads are said to follow the *sunnah* of David, the Prophet, the Fārūq or the later caliphs, the message is that they acted on the spirit of these people, not that they knew of actual rulings from them, let alone rulings transmitted form them in ḥadīth.

What is known is that the exponent of the *sunnah* of the Prophet and his model way of life would later be defined and embodied in the scholars and not the caliphs. Either this highlights that the caliph rejected the previous model, or simply had little knowledge of how to ensure it was acted upon and even transmitted.[1083] They do, however, reject the claim of those who state that 'the Umayyad concept of the caliphate was an un-

[1082] See discussion of minor references in al-Ṣanʿānī, *al-Muṣannaf*.
[1083] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph,* 55.

Islamic deviation'[1084] because in their belief there were people who viewed their leadership as a source of right practise. While this cannot be denied, there were many who spoke vehemently against aspects of their conduct which contradicted the *sunnah* of the Prophet and raised questions concerning their knowledge of his conduct or their willingness to entrench it into their way of life.

Hence, the reason why rebels who would fight the Umayyads would use the famous slogan, *'kitāb Allāh wa-sunnat nabīyihī'* (The book of God and the teachings of his Prophet). This would be used as a collocation in the lead up to major civil wars, including by ʿAlī at Ṣiffīn,[1085] his son al-Ḥusayn when seeking the support of the people of Baṣra, when he states, *'wa-ana adʿūkum ilā kitāb Allāh wa-sunnat nabīyihī fa-innal sunnah-qad umitat wa-innal bidʿa qad uḥyiyat'* (I invite you to the book of God and the teachings of his Prophet. Verily, the teachings have been destroyed and the innovations have been reborn).[1086] Furthermore, this was also the banner employed by the Tawabbūn in Iraq, al-Mukhtār and Zayd b. ʿAlī.[1087] Interestingly, when the slogan is used by the Umayyad, it is at tense moments where rebellions have begun and they aim to bring the people back to their line of thought. This can be seen in the way al-Mughīra b. Shuʿbah seeks to advise Ḥujr b. ʿAdī when he spoke out against Umayyad rule being against the very conduct of the Prophet.[1088] What is strikingly evident is that the *sunnah* was understood as a term denoting a certain way of life and certain very clear teachings which many of these companions had sought

[1084] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph,* 58.
[1085] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 279.
[1086] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 240.
[1087] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 508-569.
[1088] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 113.

to protect. The fact that each rebel would remind the caliph of the *sunnah* indicates a steady deviation emerging where the caliphate is not the seat of knowledge; rather the scholars were the people of knowledge and the caliphs were the people of administrative skills and duties.

Hinds points to the fact that two *sunnah's* emerge as early as the Ṣiffīn arbitration agreement. The first is holding on to the Book of God and the teachings of his Prophet, the second, however, takes a new slant, *'al-sunnah al-ʿadilah al-jamiʿah ghayr al-mufarriqah'* (The just *sunnah* which unites people and does not set them apart), which interestingly, does not necessarily mean the *sunnah* of the Prophet.[1089] Hinds points to the fact that Document B of the agreement seeks to be more politically correct in stating '*sunnat rasūl-Allāh al-jāmiʿah*'. Hinds believes the aim was to return to a *sunnah* on purely pre-Islamic terms, citing the pre-Islamic phrase *'ʿilf jāmiʿ ghayr mufarrriq'.*[1090] Hence al-Jāḥiẓ's anger when he states, 'Where is that *sunnah*, where should one seek it, where is its form, what is its formulation, what is the basis of its meaning?'.[1091] This question is to be examined in light of Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm*.

The title of *Khalīfat Allāh* would continue until later Umayyad dynasties, even appearing on ʿAbdul Mālik's coins. This understanding that the caliph was God's representative on the earth would later be applied to pre-Umayyad caliphs such as ʿUmar and ʿUthmān. A letter from Yazīd b. Muhallab to the caliph Sulaymān discusses *'ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb wa-ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān wa-man baʿdahum min Khulafā' Allāh'* (ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and

[1089] Hinds, "The Ṣiffīn Arbitration Agreement", 102-109.
[1090] Hinds, "The Siffīn Arbitration Agreement", 101.
[1091] Crone and Hinds, *God's Caliph*, 69.

Uthmn ibn Affn and the deputies of God after them).[1092] This did not differ too much from the Imm description of their leaders as *'khulaf' Allh f ardhih'*.[1093] Furthermore, al-Baldhur narrates how a delegation that had come to meet Muwiya from ims were instructed not to address Muwiya simply as *khalfah*. Engulfed by fear, they addressed him as the Prophet of God instead.[1094] The sources do not indicate that this was necessarily due to any respect of his religious knowledge.

Marwn describes to Muwiya the importance of his role as caliph:

> God…created from among his creatures servants whom he placed as tent pegs for the pillars of His religion; they are His guardians over the land and His deputies over the servants, and through them He has turned darkness into light, united the religion, strengthened that which is certain, granted victory and put down the overmighty.[1095]

> Abdullh ibn Masada al-Fazr would continue by telling Muwiya that 'God has made you a refuge for His friends and a source of injury for his enemies….through you, God exalted is He, makes the blind see and guides the enemies to the truth'.[1096]

While Muwiya clearly has gained mastery of knowledge of the experiences of both his people and those empires that surrounded him, certain decision raise questions regarding his knowledge and understanding of the Qurn and the Prophetic *sunnah*. When examining his life, one first has to distinguish between his

---

[1092] Al-abar, *Trkh*, vol. 3, 1334.
[1093] Al-Mufd, *Kitb al-Irshd*, tr. I.K.A. Howard (London, 1981), 193-200.
[1094] Al-Baldhur, *Ansb al-Ashrf,* vol. 4/A, 24; vol. 4/1, 109.
[1095] Ibn Qutaybah, *Immah*, 164.
[1096] Ibn Qutaybah, *Immah*, 158.

knowledge of how to build a cohesive governmental structure, which would help the co-existence of the different tribes under his command, and which was something inherited from his father Abū Sufyān, and from the knowledge of the Prophetic tradition, which in turn would relate to theological notions of the *ʿilm* which is applied and through which one serves God. Secondly, when one examines the Prophetic tradition, there are clear instances which reveal a lack of knowledge of both Qurʾānic and Prophetic traidition, very clearly indicated by the minimal number of narrations transmitted from Muʿāwiya and used for legal inference and deduction. At times, there is *ʿilm* of these traditions, but there is either a complete neglect of them or even denial. If Muʿāwiya is to be espoused as God's deputy on earth, there would be an expectation that with the minimal role of the scholars in his period as caliph, he would have ensured that his knowledge of Prophetic tradition would not only be evident but transmitted and acted upon.

Examples of Muʿāwiya's Knowledge Formed in Tradition

Amongst the examples of Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* in light of the pre-Islamic definition of that which is transferred thorugh the generations can be seen in the way he centralized power. Clearly, he had inherited and learnt from the knowledge of both his father and mother's families who were revered as being the main protagonists of Arab society and thought. He made Damascus the capital of the centralised empire. Medīna had been replaced as the centre of economic and political movements and decisions. Muʿāwiya was revered by the Syrians and this acted as a source of encouragement for him. Syrians, and in particular tribal chiefs, were vital in the continuation of his government, their

support was a necessity. The Syrians had been loyal to Mu□□wiya in the years of struggle with □Al□. They defended him and were his bedrock of support. They would safely live in their districts and did not have to struggle to move to other provinces. However, in the summer or winter, they would be given the task of raiding Byzantine territory which would result in them receiving a large amount of booty.[1097]

Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* in the pre-Islamic definition offered by Izutsu can be explored in light of the balance that he maintained between the two tribal groups known as the Yemenites and the Qaysites in Syria.[1098] These were people with an important historical right in the land. Many immigrants had left Yemen and gone to Syria due to the occurrence of economic problems and natural disasters[1099] before Islam had come to Arabia. The Arab tribes decided to settle in Syria. Ghassan settled in Damascus and H□r□n. The Sak□n of Kinda were in □ims, the Tan□kh settled in the north of the Syrian desert, the Ball□ who were from Qull□ settled in the southern part of the Syrian desert, and the Kalb tribe from Qu□□□a were settled in Palestine and Jordan.[1100] The Ban□ Ghassan,[1101] alongside other tribal groups, fought the Arabs alongside the Byzantines in the early years of the Arab conquest due to their Christian background.[1102] Yemenites and Qaysites had been major supporters of Ab□ Bakr in the conquering armies, and

[1097] Shaban, *Islamic History*, 81.
[1098] Patricia Crone, "Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad Period Political Parties?'', 1-57.
[1099] Qur□n 34:14-15.
[1100] Al Ma□s□d□, *Mur□j*, vol. 3, 215-217; al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 1, 2347; al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 59.
[1101] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 135.
[1102] Irfan Shahid, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fifth Century* (Washington D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library Collection, 1989); *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century* (Washington D.C. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library Collection, 1995); *Byzantium and the Arabs in Late Antiquity* (Bruxelles: Byzantion, 2005).

an examination of the makeup of ʿUmar's army reveals that the Yemeni's decision to opt for Iraq ahead of Syria was because of their feeling for the land of their forefathers.[1103]

The question then arises as to what made Muʿāwiya favour the Yemenites in this way. One school of thought suggests that he sought to prepare for a war with ʿAlī as well as secure his internal position in Syria.[1104] It is true that, without a doubt, both tribes occupied important positions at Ṣiffīn.[1105] A second school of thought suggests that it was his *ʿilm* which led him to conclude that a balance had to be maintained between the two respective groups. Therefore, key government seats were to be shared. Qaysite men of standing were given important positions such as Yazīd b. ʿUrr al-Absī and al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Qays al-Fihrī. A narration in *Kitāb al-Aghānī*, *'wa kāna la yafriḍu illā lil yamān'*[1106] suggests that stipends were allotted to the Yemenite tribes and this would threaten the Qays with expulsion. Shaban rejects this and relates it to immigration – 'Muʿāwiya used his authority to limit the immigration to tribesmen related to clans in Syria'. Shaban's conclusion is strengthened with the fact that regular stipends were shared with Syrian and Egyptian tribesmen in the reign of ʿAbd al-Mālik b. Marwān.[1107] The author of the *Aghānī,* however, does reach the conclusion that a balance was achieved by Muʿāwiya where they were loyal both to him and his army, with no open hostility being experienced.[1108]

Government Structure

[1103] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 1, 2187-2188.
[1104] Dixon, *The Umayyad Caliphate*, 86.
[1105] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 246
[1106] Al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī,* vol. 18, 69.
[1107] Al-Kindī, *al-Wulāt wa al-Qudāt*, 45, 49, 50.
[1108] Al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī,* vol. 18, 70.

As caliph, Mu□□wiya would choose men who were suited to their posts. Some of these appointments would be men from his own house, others would be capable men from famous clans. However, he would exercise caution in making appointments or in installing anyone into a higher position of authority. They would, as an example, be nominated to head a small city like al-□□*□*if, then if they were deemed capable, they would be given governorship of Mecca or Med□na.[1109] The Thaq□f were in a strong position in al-□□□if. If this area could be controlled, then the rest of the □ijaz would not be difficult to control. He displayed political finesse in employing helpers of Prophet Mu□ammad and his companions. As an example, al-Nu□m□n b. Bash□r al-An□□r□ was nominated as governor of □ims and later K□fah.[1110]

His nominations ensured that the administration of the government would run smoothly. The governor of the province would have capable men alongside him who collected land tax. Qays b. al-Hayth□m al-Sulam□ was not only governor but would also act as an advisor for the fiscal affairs of Khur□s□n for the governor Ibn □□m□r. □Abdull□h b. K□□im al-Sulam□[1111] would eventually replace Qays, and he in turn nominated Aslam b. Zur□a al-Kil□b□ to work with □Ubaydull□h b. Ziy□d, the governor of Khur□s□n, in fiscal affairs. This was in the year 54/674.[1112] □Ubaydull□h eventually became governor of Ba□ra, and Mu□□wiya ensure a smooth transition with Aslam remaining at the helm of Khur□s□n until 56/676 until he was replaced by Sa□□d b. □Uthm□n b. □Aff□n. The death of Is□□q b. □al□a meant that he would act as governor as well as fiscal adviser.[1113]

[1109] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 167.
[1110] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 216.
[1111] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 65.
[1112] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 168-9.
[1113] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 178-9.

Judges were employed to enforce justice in the state. These were either companions of the Prophet or from the succeeding generation. In K□fah, he installed the renowned Shuray□ b. al-□□rith al-Kind□.[1114] Uwaymir b. Qays al-Khazraj□ al-An□□r□, otherwise known as Ab□ al–Dard□, was chief judge of Damascus. When he died, he was replaced by Fa□ala b. □Ubayd al-An□□r□, al-Nu□m□n b. Bash□r al-An□□r□ and finally Bil□l b. Ab□ al-Dard□ al-An□□r□.[1115] In Ba□ra, he installed □Imr□n b. al-Husayn al-Khuz□□, □Asim b. Fa□ala and □Umayr b. Yathrib□ al-□abb□. Sulaym b. □Itr al-Terabit held office for twenty years in Egypt.[1116]

Furthermore, his kinsmen would be separated to ensure that they would not be able to form a coalition against him. The type of *□ilm* displayed here would be of understanding when to loosen and bind relations with different tribes. His ordering of the destruction of the house of Sa□□d b. al-□□□ b. Umayyah is a fundamental example. Marw□n, the then-governor of Med□na, received a letter with orders to destroy the house of Sa□□d. Marw□n refused. Upon becoming governor, Sa□□d was ordered to destroy the house of Marw□n. He would have complied with the order were it not for Marw□n's display of the previous letter given to him. They viewed this as a divide and rule policy, writing letters to Mu□□wiya expressing their feelings to him.[1117] This could be seen as evidence of his knowledge of statecraft that was inherited from his father, Ab□ Sufy□n.

Tolerance of Non-Muslims in the Affairs of the

[1114] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 81-5, 156-57.
[1115] Ibn □□l□n, *Quḍ□t Dimashq*, 1-4; Ibn Hajar, *al-Is□bah*, vol. 4, 46-206.
[1116] Al-Kind□, *al-Wul□t wa al-Qu□□t*, 303.
[1117] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, vol. 4/A, 25; al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 164-5.

State

Non-Muslims living under Mu□□wiya's rule would receive equal privileges and would be very much tolerated in the affairs of the Islamic state. While the Sassanian system was being employed in Iraq, the Byzantine system was operating in Egypt and Syria and therefore many of the non-Muslims held the administrative jobs, partly due to the lack of experience on the part of the Arabs in this field. The Byzantine system remained in place for around one hundred years after the conquest. Languages such as Pahlavi, Greek and Coptic would be used in the provinces and non-Muslims would hold the administration posts. Agents of Mu□□wiya in Med□na, Ibn Mina and Ibn al-Nad□r were non-Muslims.[1118] Christians, in particular, were given special reverence, possibly due to the background of his wife, Mays□n. The church was to be protected as a place of worship, beside the mosque in Damascus.[1119] The church of Edessaites, destroyed by an earthquake, was rebuilt by Mu□□wiya. His doctor was the renowned Ibn Uth□l. Sarj□n b. Man□□r and his fiscal adviser was also of Christian origin.[1120] Architects of Greek origin designed Mu□□wiya's home of forty years, the Green Palace.[1121]

Archive and Postal System

The bureau of the signet, or what is known today as an archive department, *the d□w□n al-kh□tam*, was enlarged by Mu□□wiya. □Abdull□h b. Mi□san al-□imyar□ was the supervisor of this department. An example of the workings of the department is

[1118] Al-Ya□q□b□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 297; al-□Al□, *Muslim Estates in the □ij□z in the First Century*, 252-3.
[1119] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 125.
[1120] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 205.
[1121] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Mu□jam Ban□ Umayyah*, 167.

reflected in an incident between Mu□□wiya and □Amr b. al-Zubayr. A letter authorizing the payment of 100, 000 dirhams to □Amr was overseen by Mu□□wiya and Ziy□d in Ba□ra. □Amr decided to open the letter and change the sum to 200, 000 dinars. Fiscal reports later clearly showed that □Amr had changed the sum and he was therefore imprisoned and ordered to return the money.[1122] This incident would result in the opening of the *diw□n* with an official stamp saying, 'There will be a reward for every good deed'.

The postal system, which Mu□□wiya inherited from the Sassanians, was subsequently strengthened by him.[1123] Horsemen would be placed on the main roads beside stations built to serve the system. Men would await the postman at these centres. There was a twelve mile distance between each station.[1124] The postal system was efficient and safe. This reorganzisation of the system would ensure that affairs would run as smoothly as other provinces within the empire.

Mu□□wiya and *□Ilm* in Light of Islamic Tradition

In light of the Islamic definition *□ilm*, Mu□□wiya should be analysed in relation to his knowledge and protection of the Qur□□n and the teachings of the Prophet. Viewing himself as God's deputy on earth, his role would be to ensure that these teachings are preserved and embodied in his character. Such an expectation would not be present in the pre-Islamic conception of *□ilm* where his knowledge was simply to protect the experiences of tribal members and understand tribal

[1122] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 205-6.
[1123] A. Silverstein, *Postal Sytems in the Pre-Modern Islamic World*.
[1124] See Ibn Manẓ□r, *Lis□n al-□Arab*; four firsakhs is equal to twelve miles, 86.

affiliations. However, the evolution of the term *ʿilm* in the Qurʾān and his position as a caliph would place him with a new responsibility as protector of caliphal law and Prophetic custom. We will now seek to examine him in light of his knowledge of ritual law, Qurʾānic verses and the respect for the teachings of the Prophet and his esteemed companions. Although we provide sparse examples, they highlight the importance of *ʿilm* as a condition of leadership.

Muʿāwiya and Ritual Law

Marwān describes to Muʿāwiya the importance of his role as the source of Islamic law and guidance:

> God…created from among his creatures servants whom he placed as tent pegs for the pillars of His religion; they are His guardians over the land and His deputies over the servants, and through them He has turned darkness into light, united the religion, strengthened that which is certain, granted victory and put down the overmighty.[1125]

ʿAbdullāh b. Masʿadah al-Fazārī would continue by telling Muʿāwiya that:

> God has made you a refuge for His friends and a source of injury for his enemies….through you, God exalted is He, makes the blind see and guides the enemies to the truth.[1126]

[1125] Ibn Qutaybah, *Imāmah*, 164.
[1126] Ibn Qutaybah, *Imāmah*, 158.

Mu□□wiya is used as an authority for a number of jurisprudential issues in □Abd al-Razz□q b. □amm□m al-Ṣan□□n□'s *al-Mu□annaf*. These include the following:

1) □Abd al-Razz□q narrates from Ibn Juray□ who narrates from Ya□ya b. Sa□□d that he read a letter from Mu□□wiya to Zayd b. Th□bit seeking his advice on an issue of inheritance concerning the grandfather and the brother. Zayd replies, saying:

> God knows best! I have lived under two caliphs before you, and they gave the grandfather half in the presence of a brother, a third in the presence, a third in the presence of two and if there were more, than there would not be a decrease on the third.[1127]

2) □Abd al-Razz□q narrates from Ma□mar who narrates from Qut□dah who narrates from Ma□bad al-Juh□n□ who narrates that he was asked by □Abd al-M□lik b. Marw□n about the law of *kit□bah*, and specifically the *muk□tib,* who left behind free children with a certain amount of wealth. Ma□bad replied by stating that □Umar had one ruling and Mu□□wiya a second, but that Mu□□wiya was the better in their eyes. When □Abd al-M□lik asks how this can be, Ma□bad replies that David was greater than Solomon, but that Solomon was in one case given an understanding of a legal issue by God better than his father.[1128]

3) □Abd al-Razz□q narrates from Akramah b. Kh□lid that he

[1127] □Abd al-Razz□q, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 10, no. 19062, 267.
[1128] □Abd al-Razz□q, *al-Muṣannaf,* vol. 8, no. 15664, 393-394.

heard from ʿUsaid b. Dhʿhir al-Anṣārī that he was governor of Yamāmah, and that he received a letter from Marwān saying that Muʿāwiya had written to him instructing him that if any man has had something stolen from him, he has a greater right over it where and when it is found. Then Marwān informed ʿUsaid of Muʿāwiya's opinion. ʿUsaid wrote to Marwān telling him that the Prophet had judged that the one who brought the stolen object from the thief and was not accused of being part of the theft, the choice is then given to the person who has had the object stolen from him as to what should be done. The person who has had his object stolen can either retrieve the value of what has been stolen or search for the thief. This was the opinion of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān. Marwān then wrote a letter to Muʿāwiya, who in turn wrote to Marwān telling him that 'Neither you or ʿUsaid b. Dhʿhir are two who give rulings ahead of me or in my presence. However, I will rule as I am now the caliph. So act as per my opinion. So Marwān sent me a letter with Muʿāwiya's opinion. So I replied I will not judge with Muʿāwiya's opinion while I am the governor'.[1129]

4) ʿAbd al-Razzāq narrates from Maʿmar from al-Zuhrī that Muʿāwiya lead the people in prayer. He bowed, then (*taʿana*) and he was in a bowing position or prostrating. Then said his blessings then said complete you prayer. So everyone prayed for themselves and nobody took his position.[1130]

5) ʿAbd al-Razzāq narrates from Ibn Jurayj who narrates from Yaʿyā b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbdullāh b. Sayfī that ʿAmr b. Yusʿf, the brother of Banū Nawfʿl, heard Muʿāwiya stand on

[1129] ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 15, no. 18829, 201.
[1130] ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 2, no. 3687, 356.

> the pulpit and say that the Day of ʿAshūra is a day of *eʿd*, whoever has fasted it then it is to be fasted on, and whoever has left it, there is no compulsion or harm (*faman sammahu faqad kāna ṣāʾim, waman tarakahu falā ḥaraj*).

Schacht was of the opinion that the Umayyads were primarily concerned with the laws of war, fiscality and other public issues. He did not believe in there being much evidence for a concern for ritual law, with the possible exception of ʿUmar II.[1131] However, these *ḥadiths* indicate that there were cases of discussion involving Muʿāwiya on ritual law, if very scarcely. The *Muṣannaf* was not available when Schacht wrote his work, yet there is a possibility that a small number of ḥadiths recorded discussing Muʿāwiya's knowledge of ritual jurisprudence would not have changed his opinion.[1132] What is evident is that Muʿāwiya's authority as a man of knowledge of the Qurʾān and the *sunnah* is questioned in the narrations. These narrations depict the need for God's deputy to be a man of *ʿilm*, and not one whose rulings are clearly rejected by prominent companions under his rule. In the first narration, Zayd views himself as the authority and not the caliph who is seeking his advice, and refers the caliph to the precedents set by two preceding caliphs. The second raises a question as to whether the judgements of the preceding caliphs can even be taken as authority with Muʿāwiya's ruling viewed as being better than ʿUmar's. Considering ʿUmar was seen as the protector of the Prophet's *sunnah*, the question would arise as to whether his knowledge of the Qurʾān and the *sunnah* was susceptible to individual opinions. In the third narration, the scholar refuses

[1131] J. Schacht, *The Origins of Muḥammadan Jurisprudence*, 198.
[1132] See also J. Brown, *Ḥadīth: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009).

to implement the law of the caliph on the grounds that the Prophet had given a different ruling. He rejects Mu□□wiya' opinion and is determined that it will not be acted upon while he is governor for Yam□mah. □Usaid is revered as one of the greatest companions, and a member of the An□□r of Med□na.

Mu□□wiya showed how, on numerous occasions, where the Qur□□n and *sunnah* have prescribed something for the Muslims to follow, he resorts to his own judgement, very much to the contrary of what had been commanded. *Ijtih□d* is a process of reasoning that discerns the law based on the material sources and hermeneutical tools. So long as a rule is to be found in the Qur□□n and the *sunnah*, the need for *ijtih□d* does not arise. However, in absence of relevant dicta in the Qur□□n, the *sunnah* or *ijm□□*, *ijtih□d* becomes a source of legislation. The caliph is the vanguard of the Qur□□n and *sunnah*, and not one who should implement his own opinion in place of their guidance. They are his tools for guiding the state in all their affairs. The following example in the sources indicate Mu□□wiya dismissing the opinion of the Qur□□n and *sunnah* when reaching a judgement.

Ziy□d was an illegitimate son of Sumayyah, with whom Ab□ Sufy□n had committed adultery while she was the wife of □Ubayd. When Mu□□wiya became caliph, he announced that Ziy□d was the son of Ab□ Sufy□n according to a witness offered by Ab□ Maryam, who in the book of *rij□l* was a known womanizer.[1133] The Prophet had stated that the 'child is to the bed and the stone is to the adulteress'. This means that the illegitimate child is to be ascribed to the husband, on whose bed his wife has committed adultery, while the adulterous wife has to be stoned. Mu□□wiya would become extremely unhappy when people would not call Ziy□d

[1133] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 6, 103.

by the name of Abū Sufyān.

When examining Muʿāwiya's leadership, a number of decisions are made which raise doubts concerning his *ʿilm*. His role would be to ensure that the religion returned to its past glory, protecting the teachings and the traditions of the Qurʾān and Prophet Muḥammad. He would have the knowledge of these traditions and ensure that his decisions would reflect such a vision. However, there are cases where two scenarios emerge. The first is that Muʿāwiya lacks knowledge of the position of the different companions who were constantly venerated by the words of the Prophet. This, however, is highly unlikely considering he lived and served some of the most revered companions such as ʿUmar and would have been in constant attendance in their gatherings or through their correspondences. The second scenario that emerges is that he had knowledge of the narrations concerning certain companions as well as knowledge of the exile of certain Arabian figures and thus completely dismisses them. These decisions raise a question concerning his role as the guide for the believers and his position as a deputy of God on earth where his respect for those personalities who were revered in the tribes of pre-Islamic Arabia are given higher respect than those who helped build the religion alongside the Prophet.

Return of Exiled Enemies

Samara b. Jundub

Samara b. Jundab, who was known in Muʿāwiya's period of rule as a great narrator of *ḥadīth*. Imām Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal narrates from Ibn ʿAbbās that it was said to ʿUmar that Samara had sold wine.

He said, ‘All□h may kill Samara. The Prophet had said All□h cursed the Jews; the fats were forbidden for them but they dissolved them and sold them’.[1134] Furthermore, in what is a well-known incident, Samara owned a palm tree growing in a garden that belonged to an An□□r in Med□na. The An□□r□’s residence was situated at the garden’s entrance. Samara would not seek the permission of the garden’s owner when coming to see his tree. Samara was told that he should seek permission, but replied by stating that he did not see this as being necessary as he owned the tree. The garden’s owner complained to the Prophet, who summoned Samara and ordered him to seek permission before he entered the garden. Samara declined. The Prophet recommended him to offer the tree for sale to make a large profit. However, this too was rejected by Samara. The Prophet then asked if he would be prepared to exchange that tree for a palm tree in paradise. However, Samar declined with contempt. Upon this, the Prophet turned to the owner of the garden and said, ‘Uproot it and throw it before him because Islam does not tolerate harm being occasioned’.[1135]

When Ziy□d appointed him as his successor in Ba□ra, he killed 8, 000 people. He did not feel ashamed about this. He said, ‘If I had killed double as much, I would not be ashamed or in fear’. He once stated, ‘If you hear that we ride our horses, you have to avoid our arrowheads’.[1136] This was the same Samara who was known to have been paid 400, 000 dirhams by Mu□□wiya to allege that verse 204 of *S□rat al-Baqarah*, which speaks about those whose talks marvel people about the Hereafter - although their

[1134] □Abd All□h b. Aḥmad b. □anbal, *Musnad* (Cairo: Maymanya Publishers, 1313 AH), vol. 1, 25.
[1135] Ibn □anbal, *Musnad*, *□adith* 2867.
[1136] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh al-Rus□l wal-Mul□k* (Cairo: al-Istiq□ma Publishers, 1939), vol. 4, 176.

hearts mean otherwise - was revealed regarding ʿAlī.[1137]

Al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah

Furthermore, Muʿāwiya had included a known adulterer in al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah. Ibn Shuʿbah had committed adultery in the seventeenth year of Hijra with a married woman known as Umm Jamīl bt. ʿAmr from the tribe of Qaysiʿ. ʿUmar had appointed al-Mughīrah as the ʿāmīr of Baṣra. He was known to leave his office at mid-day and meet Abū Bakra, one of the pious companions of the Prophet. Abū Bakra, along with Nāfiʿ b. al-Ḥārith, one of the keepers of Prophetic traditions, and Shibl b. Maʿbad had witnessed against al-Mughīrah in this case. The witness of these three men was clear and they were certain that they had seen al-Mughīrah committing his sin with their own eyes, but when the fourth witness, Ziyād b. Sumayyah came to witness, ʿUmar made him understand that he intended not to disgrace al-Mughīrah and then he asked him about what he had seen. He said:

> I heard fast breathing and I saw him sleeping on her abdomen.

ʿUmar asked him, 'Did you see him inserting his (…) into her (…) and taking [it] out like a stick in a kohl jar?' He said, 'No, but I saw him lifting her legs and I saw his testicles swaying between her thighs. I saw strong motivation and her loud breathing'. ʿUmar asked, 'Did you see him inserting his (…) and taking it out like a stick in a kohl jar?' He said, 'No I did not'. ʿUmar said, 'Allāh is great! O Mughīrah get up and beat them!' Al-Mughīrah whipped Abū Bakra eighty whips and then he whipped the rest. ʿUmar b. Shaybah mentions in his book, *Akhbār al-Baṣra,* that when Abū Bakra had been whipped, his mother

[1137] Ibn Abū al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ Nahjul Balāgha*, vol. 1, 361.

slaughtered a sheep and put its skin on Abū Bakra's back because he had been whipped so severely, although always continuing to testify to the truth of his witnessing.[1138]

Companions

Not only does one recognize that Muʿāwiya's government was made up of old enemies of the Prophet, amongst them some cursed by the Prophet, but examination of the sources indicates that many of the Prophet's most loyal companions were treated horrendously by Muʿāwiya and his officials. Those companions who pledged their allegiance to the Prophet, and fought with him, were now exiled, ridiculed and, in some cases, killed. However, an important point has to be raised in relation to the notion of the ultimate decency of all companions. To state that all the companions were always on loyal terms is absurd to say the least and a myth concocted to try and paint a glorious portrayal of the first generation of Muslims and Banū Umayyah in particular.

ʿAmmār b. Yāssir

He was one of those companions who was brutally tortured in the cause of Islam. Indeed, he had performed the two hijras to both Ethiopia and Medīna and had prayed towards the two qiblas in al-Quds and Mecca. ʿAmmār and his parents were among the first converts to Islam. His father Yāssir was from the tribe of Qaṭṭān in Yemen. ʿAmmār, together with his two brothers, came to Mecca in search of a lost brother. His brothers returned to

[1138] Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī, *al-Mustadrak ʿala l-Ṣaḥīḥayn* (India: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-Niẓāmiyet al-Kāʾima fī l-Hind, 1913), vol. 3, 448.

their homeland, but Yāssir stayed in Mecca where he entered into a covenant with Abū Hudhayfa, from the tribe of Banū Makhzūm and married his slave-girl, Sumayyah bt. Khayyāṭ. They begot two sons, ʿAmmār and ʿAbdullāh. After their conversion to Islam, Abū Jahl, with the help of other pagans, started torturing the whole family mercilessly. Iron nails were put upon their naked bodies and they were forced to lie down on the burning desert sands. The Prophet sympathised with the family, but could not offer help at the time, although he gave them glad tidings of paradise. They became the first martyrs in Islam. ʿAmmār continued in the building of Islam by joining in all the battles and constructing the mosque of the Prophet.

In a famous tradition, the Holy Prophet said about ʿAmmār:

> ʿAmmār is with the truth and the truth is with ʿAmmār. He turns wherever the truth turns. ʿAmmār is as near to me as an eye is near to the nose. Alas! a rebellious group will kill him.[1139]

Arguably the most well-known tradition relating to ʿAmmār has an important bearing on whether or not to give the title of ‘restorer of the faith’ to Muʿāwiya. All the narrators of Islamic traditions, as well as historians, have transmitted through twenty-five companions that the Holy Prophet said in regards to ʿAmmār:

> Alas! a rebellious group which swerves from the truth will murder ʿAmmār. ʿAmmār will be calling them towards Paradise and they will be calling him towards Hell. His killer and those who strip

[1139] Muḥammad b. Aḥmad Ibn Hishām, *Sīrat Sayyidna Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh*, ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld, 2 vols. (Göttingen, 1858-60; reprint, Frankfurt am Main, 1961), vol. 2, 114-5.

him of arms and clothing will be in Hell.[1140]

When ʿAlī became caliph, ʿAmmār was one of his most sincere supporters. He participated fully in all social, political and military activities during this period, especially in the first (Jamal) and second (Ṣiffīn) battles. However, ʿAmmār was martyred on 9th Safar 37 A.H. in the Battle of Ṣiffīn when he was over ninety years of age. On the day ʿAmmār b. Yāssir achieved martyrdom, he turned his face to the sky and said:

> O my Allāh! Surely Thou art aware that if I know that Thy wish is that I should plunge myself into this River (the Euphrates) and be drowned, I will do it. O my Allāh! Surely Thou knowest that if I knew that Thou would be pleased if I put my scimitar on my chest (to hit my heart) and pressed it so hard that it came out of my back, I would do it. O my Allāh! I do not think there is anything more pleasant to Thee than fighting with this sinful group, and if I knew that any action were more pleasant to Thee I would do it.[1141]

Indeed, at these moments, ʿAmmār's statements make clear that he steadfastly believed that he was firmly on the truth when fighting alongside ʿAlī and opposing Muʿāwiya. He states, 'Today I meet the beloved one, Muḥammad and his party'. Then he said: 'By Allāh, if they put us to flight to the date-palms of Hajar we know surely that we are right and they are wrong'.

> Then Ammar we struck you to believe in the Holy Qurʾān's revelation; And today we strike you to (believe in) its interpretation; Such strike as to remove heads from their resting places; And to make the friend forget his sincere friend; Until

[1140] Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqat al-kubrā*, vol. 2-3, 77-80; al-Hakīm al-Nīsābūrī, *al-Mustadrak alā l-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, vol. 3, 391.
[1141] Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, vol. 3, 308.

the truth returns to its path.[1142]

Then ʿAmmār spurred his horse, entered the battlefield and began fighting. He persistently chased the enemy, made attack after attack, and continued to speak out against the injustice carried out by those fighting ʿAlī. He asked for water. A tumbler of milk was brought to him. When ʿAmmār looked at the tumbler, he said, 'The Messenger of Allāh had said the right thing'. People asked him what he meant by these words. He said, 'The Messenger of Allāh informed me that the last sustenance for me in this world would be milk'. Then he took that tumbler of milk in his hands, drank it and surrendered his life to Allāh, the Almighty.[1143] Then ʿAlī stepped forward and offered funeral prayers for him, and then with his own hands, he buried him with his clothes.

ʿAmmār's death caused a problem for Muʿāwiya as well because there were a large number of prominent people who had been fighting from his side who were under the impression that he was fighting ʿAlī for a just cause. These people were aware of the saying of the Holy Prophet that ʿAmmār would be killed by a group who would be on the wrong side. When they observed that ʿAmmār had been killed by Muʿāwiya's army, they became convinced that they were on the wrong side and that ʿAlī was definitely on the right. Muʿāwiya quelled the uproar with the argument that it was ʿAlī who brought ʿAmmār to the battlefield and therefore it was he who was responsible for his death. When Muʿāwiya's argument was mentioned before ʿAlī, he said it was as though the Prophet was responsible for killing Hamzah since he brought him

[1142] Al-Minqarī, *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn*, 342.
[1143] Al-Minqarī, *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn*, 342.

to the Battle of U□ud.[1144]

Mu□□wiya also killed □Amr b. □amiq al Khuz□□□, who was one of the great companions of the Prophet. His head was the first head that had been carried in Islam for his loyalty to □Al□.[1145]

Cursing □Al□

Mu□awiya ordered the cursing of □Al□ although he knew very well that honouring □Al□ was a responsibility that was required of every Muslim. On numerous occasions, the Prophet stated, as narrated by □Amm□r b. Y□ssir, 'Oh □Al□, blessed is he who loves you and believes in you and woe unto him who hates you and disbelieves in you'.[1146]

It was well known that al-□asan had asked Mu□□wiya in the peace treaty to stop the cursing of □Al□ in the public arena.[1147] When having secured rule, Mu□□wiya continued bribing and cheating his way through masses.[1148] Knowing his rule was not legitimate in its nature, he had to maintain the slogan of avenging □Uthm□n's death. The public cursing of □Al□ continued, so that even on the day of □Araf□h, it became a *sunnah* for caliphs to curse. After the caliphate of □Umar II, □Abdull□h b. al-Wal□d, grandson of □Uthm□n, reminded the caliph Hish□m that on the day of □Araf□h, one should curse □Al□. However, it was Marw□n who made it clear that the cursing of □Al□ was a powerful weapon for the Umayyads.

He tells □Al□'s grandson □Al□ b. al-□usain, 'No one was more

[1144] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil,* vol. 3, 311-312.
[1145] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil,* vol. 3, 472.
[1146] Al-Hak□m al-N□s□b□r□, *al-Mustadrak al□ l-□a□□□ayn,* vol. 3, 135.
[1147] Ibn al-Ath□r, *al-K□mil*, vol. 3, 405.
[1148] Madelung, *The Succession to Mu□ammad*, 334.

temperate towards our master than your master'.

ʿAlī asked him why he cursed his grandfather. Marwān replied, 'Our reign could not have a strong base without it'.[1149]

Furthermore, when he appointed al-Mughīrah b. Shuʿbah, governor of Kūfah, he instructed him with the following ethos:

> Do not desist from abusing and censuring ʿAlī, from praying for God's mercy for ʿUthmān, from disgracing the followers of ʿAlī, from removing them and refuse listening to them, and do not cease in praising the partisans of ʿUthmān, look after them and shelter them.[1150]

He forced the people to curse willingly or unwillingly and he made it a law that cursing ʿAlī must be announced openly on the minbars every Friday and every *eīd*. This continued until 99 Hijra, when ʿUmar b. ʿAbdul-ʿAzīz banned it.[1151]

Indeed, once Muʿāwiya asked Saʿd b. Abī Waqqāṣ, 'What has prevented you from cursing Abū Turāb?' Saʿd said, 'Three things the Prophet has said to him that have made me not curse him at all. If I have one of them, it will be more beloved to me than the treasures of the world. Once the Prophet left him behind in one of the battles. He asked the Prophet, "O Prophet, why have you left me with the women and children?" The Prophet said to him, "Are you not satisfied to be to me as Aaron was to Moses except that there will be no Prophet after me?" Once again, I have heard the Prophet saying on the day of Khyber, "I will give

[1149] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, ed. Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī (Beirut, 1974), vol. 2, 184-5.
[1150] Al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, vol. 2, 112.
[1151] Ibn Abī al-Hadīd, *Sharī Nahjul Balāgha*, vol. 4, 163.

the banner to a man, who loves God and His Messenger, and His Messenger and God love him." We all looked forward to it but the Prophet said, "Send for ʿAlī". ʿAlī came while he was sore-eyed. The Prophet spit in ʿAlī's eyes and gave him the banner and Allāh granted him with victory. And when the verse of Mubāhila was revealed,[1152] the Prophet said, "O God, these are my family".[1153]

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, we have sought to look at the development of the term *ʿilm* and it's application during Muʿāwiya's leadership. We sought to make a distinction between Muʿāwiya's *ʿilm* as knowledge formed by tradition,[1154] and *ʿilm* as knowledge of the religious traditions used to guide the Muslims in all their affairs. *ʿIlm* is a characteristic stressed upon in all genres of Classical literature as being a condition for leadership in early Islam. Al-Ashʿārī and al-Juwaynī, when discussing the acquired good qualities of the leader, contended that the Imām should be viewed as an interpreter of Islamic law (*mujtahid*) with the character of a *muftī*.[1155] The Imām has to be followed by the people. He rejects the idea of the Imām being a follower. If the Imām lacks knowledge, then he has to follow a scholar and this, to al-Juwaynī, causes a major problem when one examines the conditions for leadership. He has to be in full

[1152] Qurʾān 3:59-61.
[1153] ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī, *al-Ghadeer* (Beirut: Dār al Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1970), vol. 2, *ḥadīth* 101.
[1154] Knowledge formed by tradition, akin to MacIntyre's ideas about ethics in MacIntyre, *A Short History of Ethics*.

[1155] Al-Juwaynī, *al-Ghiyāthī*, 84-85.

control of all the affairs of the state and this can only be achieved when he has the knowledge to direct each affair.[1156] Furthermore, the Im□m must use this *□ilm* to unify men and not cause disunity.[1157] The leader has two obligations, religious[1158] and earthly.[1159] He must ensure that the religion is not deformed by schisms and falsifications as well as ensure that the people follow the pillars of the religion and protect the past glory of the religion by not introducing innovations. This would ensure that conflicts are reduced and this would be the role of the leader.[1160] Furthermore, he rejects the help of non-Muslims when running the Islamic state for the protection of the affairs of the community is a religious practise which only the Muslims should be entitled to.[1161] The Im□m's role is also to ensure the execution of the traditions of the Qur□□n and Prophet Mu□ammad.[1162]

Controversy surrounds Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* and its application when leading the Islamic state as caliph. The Umayyad caliphs viewed themselves as God's deputies on earth. This was seen as their claim to religious authority. This title had three implications in Islamic thought. The first was that this was a title claimed by all Umayyad caliphs who had ruled for over a year. Secondly, it was viewed as an official designation for the Umayyad head of state. Thirdly, when the title *khal□fah* was discussed, it was in reference to God's deputies on earth. This was seen as a major point of difference between the Umayyad caliphate and the caliphs that had preceded their reign, who were known with the

[1156] Al-Juwayn□, *al-Ghiy□th□*, 87.
[1157] Al-Juwayn□, *al-Ghiy□th□*, 90.
[1158] Al-Juwayn□, *al-Ghiy□th□*, 183.
[1159] Al-Juwayn□, *al-Ghiy□th□*, 201.
[1160] Al-Juwayn□, *al-Ghiy□th□*, 183.
[1161] Al-Juwayn□, *al-Ghiy□th□*, 150-157.
[1162] Al-D□b, *Im□m al-Ḥ□ramayn*, 179-181.

title ‘successor of the messenger of God’, especially Abū Bakr.

When examining Muʿāwiya’s *ʿilm*, using the inter-textual method of analysis, there is no doubt that he displayed knowledge of the tribes that surrounded the Islamic empire and the need to maintain relations with them. This *ʿilm* is viewed by Izutsu as the very definition of *ʿilm* in pre-Islamic Arabia. Muʿāwiya’s relations with tribes within and outside of Syria indicate a knowledge inherited from his father and mother’s respective families. He used this *ʿilm* to build a very strong government structure. However, his knowledge in relation to the Qurʾān and *sunnah* is minimal, especially in light of the number of narrations where he is taken as an authority in ritual law, as concluded by Schacht. *ʿIlm,* viewed theologically as being a necessity for leadership, was often not witnessed in the character of Muʿāwiya, especially in light of his relationship with esteemed companions of Muḥammad, his protecting of the Qurʾān’s traditions, and his willingness to protect those who opposed these traditions by offering, in the case of the likes of al-Mughīrah, governmental posts. The evidence raises the question as to the validity of Muʿāwiya being called a guide for the Muslims, when there were clear instances of his knowledge being used to deviate rather than guide.

Al-Sijistānī, moreover, views Muʿāwiya’s leadership as illegitimate and raises a question mark concerning his *ʿilm.* He quotes a narration where the Prophet not only curses Muʿāwiya, but also states that ‘if you see Muʿāwiya on my pulpit, then kill him’.[1163] He discusses how Muʿāwiya fought ʿAlī at Ṣiffīn, and asks who was on the truth and who is defined as the infidel. If the people say both are on the truth, then there is a

[1163] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 170.

contradiction in this analysis. If the people say ʿAlī is on the truth, then how can an infidel become the leader of the people. Al-Sijistānī asks the question as to whether he became leader through the trickery and deception of the people of Shām or because of Godly attributes inherent within his character such as *ʿilm.*[1164]

He concludes that his leadership was attained through compulsion and deception, 'like the kings of Turkey, Rome and India' and not because of his unerring *ʿilm*.[1165] Furthermore, the treaty between Ḥassan b. ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya does not negate Ḥasan's leadership, nor does it in anyway legitimize Muʿāwiya's. The fact that he asked for a treaty indicates his knowledge that leadership was in the hands of the grandson of the Prophet, according to al-Sijistānī. Al-Sijistānī praises Ḥasan's wisdom, when recognizing that he was not as fully equipped as Muʿāwiya for war. He quotes 16:106 of the Qurʾān, where the exception is made for the believer who is under compulsion while his heart believes, and applies it to Ḥasan's abdication.[1166] Muʿāwiya's final act against Ḥasan, having signed a treaty with him, was to treacherously arrange for his poisoning, thus highlighting his lack of courage.[1167] To al-Sijistānī, self-control is a component of *ʿilm* and not separate. The reason it was never seen as an attribute of leadership was because it was expected of the caliph, in using his all-encompassing *ʿilm,* to have a mastery of self-control. To credit Muʿāwiya with *ʿilm* highlights a deficiency in his complete *ʿilm.* His final act as caliph was to ensure that Yazīd was appointed as his successor, which, to al-Sijistānī, revealed his true aspiration to change the caliphate

[1164] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 170.
[1165] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 171.
[1166] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 171.
[1167] Al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* 171.

into a despotic kingship.[1168]

Conclusion

Our purpose throughout this work has been to engage in a historiographical study of the caliphate of Mu□□wiya b. Ab□ Sufy□n in light of the construction of the concept of leadership in early Islam. In contrast to previous works of scholarship, our purpose was not only to understand the approach and objectives of early Muslim historians in their depiction of Mu□□wiya's period of rule, but to extend the analysis to examining his leadership using *adab*, jurisprudential and theological literature from the 3rd to 6th century AH, using the inter-textual approach. The conditions for leadership were examined in addition to the attributes that were expected of the leader of the nascent Islamic community. We looked at different periods and episodes during the leadership of Mu□□wiya which would allow us to shed light on the position and importance of these attributes. Three conditions for leadership were examined, using the inter-textual approach, namely *□ilm*, *□ilm* and *shuj□□a*. After examining each of these attributes, we have found the conclusion regarding the depiction of Mu□□wiya has been similar, revealing a great disparity between what was expected of the leader of the Islamic polity and what was seen in Mu□□wiya's period of rule. Herein lies what could be seen as the first substantial finding of this work. Our second substantial finding is to reject the theory that any pro-□Alid genre of literature indicates an Im□m□ bias. Thirdly, the inter-textual approach allows us to gain a more thorough understanding of Mu□□wiya's

[1168] Al-Sijist□n□, *Kit□b al-Iftikh□r,* 171.

caliphate and is a method of source criticism that can be used in examining the biographies of many figures throughout Islamic history.

Islamic Historiography

We have examined the development of Islamic history and historiography by asking the following questions. In which way was the material preserved in pre-Islamic Arabia and when was this material then transferred into written form?[1169] Furthermore, are all sources to be dismissed simply because they were not contemporary with the event or can we argue that these sources may have been preserved by people who were eager to preserve and transcribe their history? While some may argue that the community intrinsically had an inclination to transcribe primary sources so as to preserve the message of Islam, we have found that the themes that emerge in the evolution of Islamic historical writing indicate a search for identity and legitimacy in the early community.

It is clear that Muslims not only sought to differentiate themselves from other monotheists, but sought to understand their identity politically and theologically within a community of believers. We argue in reply to the sceptics, that much of the material at hand did not necessarily subscribe to later political attitudes. The accusation of prejudice in writing and narrating and the idea of schools supporting each other is seen as weak by Noth and Conrad. Their 1973 study was a critical piece in the development of Islamic historiography, translated by Dr. Michael Bonner. The authors examined the theory of

[1169] G. Schoeler, *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*, Preface.

the *Ḥijāzī* school, in contrast to the *Irāqī* school. The *Irāqī* school, to many historians, would show more inconsistencies and therefore the *Ḥijāzī* school was continuously seen as unreliable. The authors differ with this opinion. They show how authors such as al-Yaʿqūbī, with his Shīʿī inclination, provides a historical outline that is essentially Sunnī. What they sought to propose was a much wider framework than the compiler or the school, a framework which looked primarily at the evolution of history and historical writing.[1170]

Kūfah and Baṣra would become centres for historical tradition. The writings of Abū Mikhnaf, through extracts from al-Ṭabarī and al-Balādhurī, would number more than thirty on different topics, including the conflicts of Iraq and Syria until the end of the Umayyad dynasty.[1171] Another example is the work of ʿAwwanah b. al-Ḥakam, which would show the Umayyad version in contrast to Abū Mikhnaf's pro-ʿAlid stances. Sayf b. ʿUmar of Kūfah also emerges, a controversial figure narrating the history of the conquests and dissentions of the time. Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, whose books would focus on Shīʿī history, was also a Kūfan. Finally, al-Madāʾinī, who was born in Baṣra and became distinguished in Baghdād, concludes this rise in *Akhbāriyyūn*. He 'synthesizes history as well as literary studies'[1172] with the *isnād* playing a greater role in his collections. Al-Madāʾinī would make use of all the available sources, including those of Medīna and Baṣra, raising the status and quality of his research.

[1170] Noth and Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition*, 15.
[1171] On Abū Mikhnaf as an example, see K.S. al-Jabbūrī, *Nuṣūṣ min Tārīkh Abī Mikhnaf Lūṭ b. Yaḥyā b. Saʿīd al-Jāmidī al-Azdī l-Kūfī l-Mutawaffa* [157 H] (Beirut: Dār al-Rasūl al-Akram, 1999). Abū Mikhnaf's full name was Lūṭ b. Yaḥyā (d. 170 AH). He is known for being a historian of the Shīʿīs. See al-Najāshī, *Rijāl al-Najāshī*, vol. 2, 191-193 [no. 873]; Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Lisān al-mīzān* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1987-1988), vol. 4, 584 [no. 6776/8].
[1172] Dūrī, *The Rise of History Among the Arabs*, 49.

The tensions of the earliest years of Islam are all very clearly narrated, and had there been a fine-coating on these, they would have been changed or glossed over. The thesis concurs with Donner in his conclusion that historical writing can be summarized in the following stages : the first being the Pre-Historicist phase (to c. 50 AH), the second being the Proto-Historicist phase (c. 25 AH to c. 100 AH), the third being the Early Literate phase (c. 75 AH to c. 150 AH) and the fourth being the Late Literate phase ('Classical Islamic Historiography' c. 125 AH to c. 300 AH).[1173] The Pre-Historicist phase refers to a community that was more concerned with individual piety and following revealed law rather than a community which had 'formulated historical questions related to its own self-conception'.[1174] They were still not defined in relation to any particular historical event. Affiliation was to the tribe and tribal conventions were mainly followed. Narratives in this period were seen as providing information about the past and acted as guides for moral purposes amongst others. Some of these materials were used to clarify passages of the Qur□□n and would later be embedded in commentaries. Tribal accounts would discuss pre-Islamic Arabia. This marks the shift from *□Ayy□m al-□Arab* and poetic narratives to *akhb□r*.

The Proto-Historicist phase would see the rise of historical concerns in the community for the first time.[1175] Political and theological issues would now be issues discussed within the community of the believers. Furthermore, the expansion of the state would result in more interaction with other monotheistic

[1173] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 276-82.
[1174] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 276.
[1175] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 277.

faiths and their followers.[1176] This interaction would result in debates concerning issues such as the Trinity.[1177] Debates would take place between the believers on creedal issues such as the belief in Muḥammad as the last messenger of God and the validity of the Qurʾān. The Jews and the Christians would question verses of the Qurʾān which portray them in a seemingly negative light.[1178] Several important themes emerge for the first time in this period as a result of these debates.[1179] Muḥammad's status as a Prophet would result in the emergence of the theme of *nubuwwah*, the community under the leadership of Muḥammad would result in the emergence of the theme of the *ummah*, and the expansion of the state would result in the emergence of the theme of *futūḥ*.[1180] Donner discusses the role of the Umayyad caliphs in this period and their role in the protection of such material:

> We can suggest, tentatively, that the Umayyad caliphs took a major role in encouraging the collection and recording of information on these themes; as rulers of the community of Believers, it was in their own interest to foster the legitimist claims of the community as a whole against its rivals.

Indeed, the rivalry between Muʿāwiya and ʿAlī, a rivalry that would be vital in the understanding of Muʿāwiya's leadership, would bring about the rise of a new theme, *fitnah*.[1181] The claims

---

[1176] Fred Donner, "From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community'', in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, IV: Patterns of Communal Identity,* ed. Lawrence I. Conrad (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2003).
[1177] H. Busse, "Monotheismus und Islamische Christologie in der Bauinschrift des Felsendoms in Jerusalem'', *Theologische Quartalschrift,* 161 (1981), 168-178, as cited by Donner in *Narratives of Islamic Origins,* 313.
[1178] G.J. Reinink, "The Beginnings of Syriac Apologetic Literature in Response to Islam", *Oriens Christianus,* 77 (1993), 165-187.
[1179] See M. Morony, *Iraq after the Muslim Conquest* (Princeton: N.J.; Princeton University Press, 1984).
[1180] See H. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Kalam* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976).
[1181] E. Petersen, *ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya*, Introduction.

of each side would be bolstered by reporting the dissension which arose on the issue of Islamic authority.[1182] Both sides would ensure that their leaders were well represented in these accounts. Importantly, we can see these accounts seem to emerge in the final part of the 1st century, which would have meant the presence of contemporary narrators.[1183] These narrators would seek to build an account on the basis of what they personally remembered as well as the recollection of the people that surrounded them.

Furthermore, it seems to us highly plausible that letters and poems would be vital sources in building an account of the incident. While obviously a lot of material may have been lost or simply seen as insignificant, the material that related to the civil wars was preserved –with people such as Sa□□d b. al-Musayyab and Ibn Shih□b al-Zuhr□, synthesising 'these materials into fairly coherent stories related to particular themes'.[1184]

The Early Literate phase would see the transmission from oral to written material evolving gradually.[1185] Accounts of great lengths were also being harmonised with other accounts to remove any conflicts that may have emerged. However, there were also fabrications which occurred in this period, especially in light of discussions concerning theological and political issues. Importantly, in relation to Mu□□wiya, the *S□rat al-khulaf□□* literature or *khal□fah* literature as well as the administration that they presided over saw its crystallization in this period,

[1182] N. A. Faris, "Development in Arab Historiography as Reflected in the Struggle Between □Al□ and Mu□□wiyah" in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. P. M. Holt and B. Lewis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).
[1183] G.H.A. Juynboll, *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982).
[1184] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 279.
[1185] A. Elad, "The Beginnings of Historical Writing by the Arabs: The Earliest Syrian Writers on the Arab Conquests", *JSAI*, 28 (2003), 65-152.

and would imply early material. The Late Literate phase would see even more crystallizing of the early narratives which were recollected on a number of occasions. They would now include themes such as the chronology and the Riddah wars. Donner suspects that this period marked a turning point for the Umayyads and their claims for caliphal legitimacy as they were no longer in the seat of power in the Islamic state. 'Accounts were edited, selected, or dropped, according to political, theological and social needs of the compilers and the interests of the community. We can speculate, for example, that many accounts bolstering Umayyad and Zubayrid political legitimacy vanished during this phase, after the two families claims to the caliphate in the east had become moot through their political defeats - the main operative here being probably that such material had become irrelevant to current political discussions and so was dropped, not that it was intentionally 'suppressed by the authorities'.[1186]

We discussed how this period saw the emergence of the format of writing *akhbār* and the science of *ḥadīth*. Earlier generation of monographs were used to produce larger compilations. The compiler would ensure that certain themes were included above others and at times would reflect their partisan bias. Compilers from the 3rd century and later would experience difficulties producing innovative works, as in many cases they used material that, although had come from earlier phases of the Islamic community, had:

> confronted them with themes that had to be dealt with, and imposed on them also serious gaps in information on subjects that had not been of interest to earlier

[1186] Donner, *Narrative of Islamic Origins*, 281.

believers.[1187]

The thesis employed the different genres of Islamic literature from the 3rd to 6th century to examine Mu□□wiya's leadership. *□ilm*, *□ilm* and *shuj□'a* were viewed as attributes discussed in debates concerning leadership in this period.

□ilm

Many scholars, in both classical and contemporary circles, have sought to define him as a man of *□ilm*. What is evident is that *□ilm* was an attribute fitting of a leader in pre-Islamic Arabia and was not necessarily revered as an attribute of the leader of the Islamic polity. Furthermore, even if it was to be taken as an attribute of an Islamic leader, the definition of a *□al□m* is still questionable when examining his period of rule. Mu□□wiya's *□ilm* is evident, for example, in his treatment of non-Muslims. While the Sassanian system was being employed in Iraq, the Byzantine system was operating in Egypt and Syria and therefore many of the non-Muslims held administrative jobs, partly due to the lack of experience of the Arabs in this field. Languages such as Pahlavi, Greek and Coptic would be used in the provinces and non-Muslims would hold the administration posts. Ibn Mina and Ibn al-Nadir were non–Muslims agents of Mu□□wiya in Med□na.[1188] Christians, in particular, were given special reverence, possibly due to the background of his wife, Mays□n. The church was to be protected as a place of worship, beside the mosque in Damascus.[1189] The church of the Edessaites, destroyed by

[1187] Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 281.
[1188] Al-Ya□q□b□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 297; □alih al-□Al□, "Muslim Estates in □ij□z in the First Century", *JESHO*, vol. 2 (1959), 252-3.
[1189] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Fut□□ al-Buld□n*, 125.

an earthquake, was rebuilt by Mu□□wiya.[1190] His doctor was the renowned Ibn □Uth□l. Sarj□n b. Man□□r, his fiscal adviser, was also of Christian origin. Architects of Greek origin designed Mu□□wiya's home of forty years, the Green Palace. [1191]

However, his execution of □ujr and his companions would raise doubts concerning his *□ilm* as leader of the Islamic polity. When □ujr and his companions were sitting in the congregation, they heard Ziy□d condemn son in law of the Prophet and the fourth caliph. Ziy□d attacked their stance and revolt. He first forged a story that they were looking to dissolve the caliphate of Mu□□wiya by revolting against his governor in Iraq. Secondly, he used their love for the family of the Prophet as a negative belief which had to be destroyed.[1192] From what we can determine, the origin of Islam was built on the foundation of love and its expression for Mu□ammad's nearest relatives, but was now seen as a threatening armour in the hands of □ujr and his followers. Seventy men of different tribes signed the accusations of Ziy□d.[1193]

Shuj□□a

It was an honor for a man to be described as courageous and brave, as Ka□b b. M□lik seeks to describe such a man as 'unfaltering in danger, no weakling they; bold and intrepid against their enemy in every arena of battle'.[1194]

[1190] See also G. Fowden, *Qu□ayr □Amra: Art and the Umayyad Elite in Late Antique Syria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1st Edition, Sept 2004) and N. el-Cheikh, *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Centre for Middle-Eastern Studies, 2004).
[1191] Al-□abar□, *T□r□kh*, vol. 2, 205.
[1192] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□f*, vol. 4A, 236-237.
[1193] Al-Bal□dhur□, *Ans□b al-Ashr□,f* vol. 4A, 223.
[1194] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 84.

When we examined Mu□□wiya's valour, we expected to find a leader to display personal courage, especially in seeking to defend an ally, a citizen or a member of his family. One who would be willing to bravely sacrifice his own life and the lives of those who surrounded him both external and internal to the state. Any dangerous situation that would emerge should result in the leader being willing to send reinforcements, guided with his personal presence, to help rectify what has happened and bring peace and success. As Dir□r al-Kha□□□b would say in his definition of *shuj□□a* in the pre-Islamic era:

> My lineage goes not back to weaklings and unarmored, nor to some abject, miserable coward on the battlefield,
> But a son of those warriors am I, who used to smite the streaks of the helms whenever they met them, Who with long sword-belts, imperturbably went to death.[1195]

Yet the lack of personal courage Mu□□wiya that we have found displayed in the case of □Uthm□n raises a major question as to his courage in every aspect of his leadership, for it was this incident which highlighted his unwillingness, if it was not previously recognized through his actions in the external conquests, to risk his life for a higher goal in the Islamic state.

Furthermore, Mu□□wiya displays little bravery when Abraha b. al-□abb□□ al-□imyar□, the grandson of the □imyarite rulers, asks him to fight □Al□ in one on one combat, and that people would support whoever kills his opponent.[1196] Mu□□wiya could only reply by stating that Abraha's mind has been afflicted. The poet Zuhayr describes how *shuj□□a* in non-Arab circles was what would

[1195] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 84.
[1196] Al-Minq□r□, *Waq'at □iff□n*, 457-9.

be described as cruelty and pure ferocity displayed in any tribal feud:

> It is not enough for a warrior, fierce as a lion, to strike back and chastise his enemy when the latter has struck him a blow, he should rather take the initiative and become an aggressor when no one wrongs him.[1197]

□Ilm

To the Umayyads, the era of Prophethood ended and the era of God's caliph had begun. They would be more interested in speaking of themselves as *Khal□fat All□h*. Hoyland's work on non-Muslim Syrian sources suggest that they also do not mention □Al□ as caliph. He does not feature at all in Christian lists of Muslim rulers, but rather as simply '□□m□r of □ir□'.[1198] The papyri do not refer to the Prophet in that period; and the Arab-Byzantine coins of that period where the Prophet's name appears are dated back to the Marw□nid rather than the earlier Sufy□nid period.[1199] Even Mu□□wiya's inscription at □□'if fails to make any mention of the Prophet.[1200] An interesting development in later Umayyad thought is how this undermining of the Prophet's authority would continue when □ajj□j writes a letter to □Abd al-M□lik discussing his opinion that the caliph of God on earth was higher than his Prophet in God's eyes, *'inna khal□fat All□h f□ ardhih□ akram □alayh□ min Rasul□h□'* and he was higher than the Prophet's and the angels, *'al-Khal□fah □indall□h afdhal min al-*

[1197] Izutsu, *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n*, 84.
[1198] R. Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1997), 140-142, quoting George of Resh'aina, "An Early Syriac Life of Maximus XXIII", 312-313.
[1199] M. Bates, "The Arab-Byzantine Bronze Coinage of Syria", 23.
[1200] G.C. Miles, "Early Islamic Inscriptions Near □□'if in the □ij□z", *JNES,* 7 (1948).

malā’ikat al-muqarrabīn wa al-anbiyā’ al-mursalīn’.[1201] One may argue that al-Ḥajjāj is extreme in his sentiments towards ʿAbd al-Malik, as one can ascertain from his opinion that people should circumbulate the grave of ʿAbd al-Malik rather than the Prophet.

While Muʿāwiya clearly has gained mastery of the knowledge of the experiences of both his people and those empires that surrounded him, certain decisions raise questions regarding his knowledge and understanding of the Qurʾān and the Prophetic *sunnah*. When examining his life, one first has to distinguish between his knowledge of how to build a cohesive governmental structure which would help the co-existence of the different tribes under his command, something inherited from his father Abū Sufyān, and the knowledge of the Prophetic tradition. Secondly, when one examines the Prophetic tradition, there are clear instances which reveal a lack of knowledge of both the Qurʾānic and Prophetic tradition, very clearly indicated by the minimal number of narrations transmitted from Muʿāwiya and used for legal inference and deduction. At times, there is *ʿilm* of these traditions, but either complete neglect of them and at times denial. If Muʿāwiya is to be espoused as God’s deputy on earth, there would be an expectation that with the minimal role of the scholars in his period as caliph, he would have ensured that his knowledge of Prophetic tradition would not only be evident but transmitted and acted upon.

Muʿāwiya’s *ʿilm* was also examined, especially when examining his treatment of the revered companions of the Prophet such as ʿAmmār b. Yāsir. The depiction in the sources of a lack of *ʿilm*

[1201] Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihī, *al-ʿIqd al-farīd*, vol. 5, 51.

can also be seen in his leniency towards enemies of the Prophetic message. Further to the examples provided within the thesis and using the model the thesis proposes of examining all literary genres, one may examine his leniency towards al-Walīd b. ʿUqbah b. Abī Muʿayṭ, a well known adviser to Muʿāwiya as he sought to build a government. ʿUqbah, his father, was one of the staunch enemies of the Prophet. In the time of ʿUthmān, al-Walīd was appointed the governor of Kūfa. In addition to being the leader of the respected city, the governor was also given the responsibility of leading the congregational prayer. *ʿaḥādīth* narrate that one evening al-Walīd drank an excessive amount of alcohol and in a state of intoxication, went to the mosque and performed four units of the morning prayer instead of two.[1202] We see that it was his poetry was used to arouse Muʿāwiya in his quest for kingship:

> By God, Hind will not be your mother if the day passes,
> Without the avenger taking revenge for ʿUthmān.
> Can the slave of the people kill the Lord of the household
> And you do not kill him? Would your mother were barren!
> Surely if we kill them no one can legitimately retaliate
> For them, the wheels of fortune have turned on you.[1203]
> He could not accept seeing Muʿāwiya give in to his enemy.
>
> From scorpions, the dealing in his eyes was now with snakes;
> Muʿāwiya; surely Syria is your Syria; so hold on to your Syria, do not let
> The snakes come into you,
> And protect her with legions and lances; do not be faint

[1202] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 5, 32-5 - the Banū Muṭalaq verse.
[1203] Al-Isfahānī, *Kitāb al-Aghānī* (Būlaq, 1868), vol. 1, 177.

with dried up forearms
Surely ʿAlī is watching what you will answer him,
So present him with a war that will turn the forelocks hoary.
If not, make peace, certainly in peace there is repose, for him who does not desire
Was, so choose, Muʿāwiya!
Surely, a letter which you, Ibn Ḥarb have written, out of greed will drive disasters
Towards you.
You have asked ʿAlī in what you will not obtain, and if you obtained it, it would last
Only some nights.
You would face from him that after which there is no survival, so do not fill yourself
With hopes.
Will you strike the likes of ʿAlī with a ruse? Sufficient is what you have tasted before.
Were his claws once to cling to you, he would deal out to you, Ibn Hind, what
You have been dealing out.[1204]

Future Usage

Our understanding of other revered personalities in Islamic history can be further enhanced through the method of source criticism known as the inter-textual approach. An interesting exercise here may be the analysis of multiple personalities from the same era of Islamic history by comparing and contrasting their depictions within different genres of Islamic literature.

[1204] Al-Minqarī, *Waqʿat Ṣiffīn*, 52-3.

This would allow us to systemize the corpus of literature available and, as a result, would help scholars portray a clearer picture of events and the eras in which they occurred. Utilizing this methodology will allow us to have a greater understanding of Islamic historiography, thus in turn allowing us to have a better understanding of Islamic history itself. However, can we then say that we would now have a definitive understanding of the events of the first two centuries of Islamic civilization? The answer is undoubtedly no; indeed, we might never have a complete understanding of events transpiring in the past. We will, however, understand the motives behind both the historical narrator and the historical narrative. The thesis concludes that modern historiography needs to be more nuanced in its approaches to schools of history and not dismiss K□fan scholarship as merely Sh□*□*□.

While it is true that scholars such as Hodgson, Keshk, and Noth have examined pietistic and tribal influences on Islamic narratives, their findings have been solely based upon historical literature without the use of other genres such as belles-lettres and theological texts which would, of course, impact upon their conclusions. The model employed in this thesis can be used to shed further light on the depictions and indeed biographies of other revered personalities in Islamic history. History is centred on individuals and is personalised through biography and so we find that biography is the most vivid type of history that can be written in almost any literary tradition. 'In this sense, biography stands for or substitutes for history'.[1205] The analysis of the life of an individual such as Mu□□wiya helps symbolize and prefigure the larger history of a people, community and nation. Certain cultures see history

[1205] T. Kh□lid□, *Images of Muhammad* (New York: Doubleday, 2009), 3.

through the lens of biography.[1206]

In conclusion, after the above exercise in source criticism, we have listed numerous sound reasons to argue that the theory that Mu□□wiya was 'on the right side of history and the wrong side of the historians' is rejected. Rather, the sources from this period depict him as a man who usurped the position of caliph, and led a despotic kingdom, often wrongly credited with attributes which, when further examined, failed to stand up to the classical depiction that had been reserved for him by both Arab and Western historians at large. We have found that the often restricted and extremely limited approach of those scholars whose findings have preceded this study have somewhat hindered their research and their ability to comprehensively demonstrate the conclusion that, by all accounts, Mu□□wiya's personality does not seem in anyway vindicated from the classical theory that he was a political despot. If anything, this holistic approach of analysing various genres of literature has allowed for some of the qualities once thought to be typical of Mu□□wiya to be false. The findings of this thesis, using sources from the 3rd to the 6th centuries AH/9th to the 12th centuries CE, have stripped the classical understanding of Mu□□wiya as being a man of *□ilm* to more accurately demonstrate how these assertions of the nature of his character were in fact mere empty claims with little evidence to maintain their reality. The same is true of the quality of *shuj□'a, a*nd even the quality of *□ilm*, two characteristics which this thesis has demonstrated are somewhat lacking within Mu□□wiya's personality.

Moreover, the inter-textual approach employed throughout this

[1206] Kh□lid□, *Arabic Historical Thought*, 207-210; M. Cooperson, *Classical Arabic Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), ch. 1.

thesis can be used to conduct a more holistic analysis of not only other theological topics, but also the caliphate of Mu□□wiya itself; if literature from the post-6th century were to be included in the scope of investigation, the findings may have alluded to things more substantial. For example, by analysing what someone like Ibn Taym□yyah in his *Kitab al-Siy□sa al-Shar□'ah bayna al-R□'y wa R□'iyah* defined as leadership and then comparing it to the administration of Mu□□wiya. In utitilizing this intertextual approach in other areas, it would also prove to be fascinating in analysing and providing a depiction of other personalities and subjects within the formative period of Islamic history, for example, the period of *□*Uthm□n b. *□*Aff□n as a leader or even *□*Al□ b. Ab□ □□lib.

This study could have been further enhanced by examining the development of the concept of kingship during Mu□□wiya's reign . Future studies may seek to examine the distinction between caliph and king. This distinction, although developed with consequentiality in Im□m□ works, as a distinction between the pietistic and eschatological notion of the caliphate and the profane kingship of the Umayyads can be seen within the examination of Mu□□wiya's leadership. The difference is made evident between caliph and king, as well as between caliph and prophet, in relation to social order. This difference is articulated by Ab□ Hayy□n al-Tawh□d□ who defines it in terms of 'an apostolate, the one visible and explicit in prophets, the other implicit in kings'.[1207] Al-Azmeh comments on this by stating that:

> Distinctions between kingship and caliphate are made, and are

[1207] A. al-Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship* (New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 1997), 163.

> made in two specific ways: through the pietistic and ultimately eschatological vision of history as a history of salvation, and through the designation of legitimate order by the juristic elaboration of public life, that is, by juristic legitimism in its conception of the caliphate.[1208]

For Qu□b, Ab□ Sufy□n would always look to postulate the theory of an Arab monarchy when he states that Ab□ Sufy□n was, of course, dreaming of a monarchy which would be hereditary among the Umayyads ever since □Uthm□n became caliph, and indeed, on that day he said: 'O Umayyads, take the power now, once and for all. For by him in Whose name Ab□ Sufy□n swears, I have always hoped for this on your behalf - that this power might be yours and your children's by right of inheritance'.[1209]

Indeed, one of the most controversial areas discussed in regards to Mu□□wiya's rule within secondary sources is that of the appointment of his son Yaz□d. The reality of the controversy was not that a son followed a father, but rather that Yaz□d ruled when al-□usayn is killed. Many regard the *bay□ah* to Yaz□d as logical, considering the power achieved at the time by Mu□□wiya and the Syrians. *□ilm* once again is used as an argument by Hawting, highlighting the caliph's clever powers of persuasion to encourage those around him.[1210] Yet he discusses the fact that this was the base of the arguments of kings rather than caliphs. A caliph consults , a king does not:

> Above all the charge of kingship is connected with the decision of Mu□□wiya to appoint his own son Yaz□d as his successor to the caliphate during his own lifetime. This event, more than anything

[1208] Al-Azmeh, *Muslim Kingship*,163.
[1209] Qu□b, *Social Justice in Islam*, 181.
[1210] Hawting, *The First Dynasty in Islam,* 43.

else, seems to be behind the accusation that Mu□□wiya perverted the caliphate into kingship. What was wrong with Mu□□wiya's appointment was that one man took it upon himself to choose a caliph with no consultation with the representatives of Islam and without even a token nod to the idea that the office should be elective.[1211]

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ibn □Abd al-Barr, Y□suf b. □Abdull□h, *al-Ist□□□b f□ ma□rifat al-a□□□b*, ed. A. al-Bajj□w□, 4 vols. (Cairo, n.d.).

Ibn □Abd al-□akam, □Abd al-Raḥm□n b. □Abd All□h, *Futu□ Mi□r wa-Akhb□ruha* (Baghdad, 1967).

_____, *Futūḥ Mi□r* (al-Q□hirah: Maktabat al-Thaq□fah al-D□n□yah, 1995).

Ibn Ab□ al-□ad□d, □Izz al-D□n Ab□ □am□d, *Shar□ Nahjul Bal□gha* (Cairo: D□r al-kutub al-□Arab□yyah, 1944).

Ibn □Abd Rabbih□, A□mad b. Mu□ammad, *al-□Iqd al-far□d*, ed. A□mad Am□n, A□mad al-Zayn and Ibr□h□m al-Iby□r□ (Cairo: Lajnat al-Ta'lif wa al-Tarjama wa al-Nashr, 1948).

□Alam al-Hud□, al-Shar□f Ab□ l-Q□sim □Al□ b. al-Husain al-

[1211] Hawting, *The First Dynasty in Islam,* 14.

Murta□□ aka Dh□l-Majdain, "*Majmu'a fi fun□n min □ilm al-kal□m*'' in *Naf□'is al-makht□□t□t,* ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl-Y□s□n, 1st edition (Baghd□d: al-Ma'arif, 1955).

_____, "*al-Uṣ□l al-itiqa□□yya''* in *Naf□'is al-makht□□t□t,* ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl-Y□s□n, 1st edition (Baghd□d: al-Ma'□rif, 1955).

_____, *al-Sh□f□ fil Im□ma* (Tehran, 1301/1884).

al-Am□n□, □Abd al-Ḥusayn, *al-Ghadeer* (Beirut: D□r al Kit□b al-□Arab□, 1970).

_____, *al–Ghad□r fil Kit□b wal Sunnah wal Adab* (Qum: Fur□ al-D□n Publishers, 1995).

Asad□b□d□, □Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad, *F□raq wa-□tabaq□t al-mu□tazilah* (Cairo: Dār al-Ṭib□□ah al-J□mi□□yah, 1972).

_____, *al-Mughn□* (Cairo: al-Mu'assasa al-Mi□r□yya al-□□mma lil-ta'l□f wal-anb□' wal-nashr, 1961-5).

Ibn □As□kir, □Al□ b. al-□asan, *Ta□r□kh Mad□nat Dimashq*, ed. Mu□ibb al-D□n Ab□ Sa□□d □Umar b. Ghar□ma al-□Amraw□ (Beirut: D□r al-Fikr, 1995-1998).

al-Ash□□r□, Ab□ al-Hasan □Al□ b. Ism□□□l, *Kit□b al-Ib□nah □an uṣ□l al-diy□nah* (Hyderabad: 1321/1903); tr. by W.C. Klein as *The Elucidation of Islam's Foundation* (New Haven: 1940).

_____, Abū al-Ḥasan Alī b. Ismāʿīl, *Kitāb al-Luma'*, text and translation in R. J. McCarthy, *The Theology of al-Ashʿarī* (Beirut: 1953).

_____, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn,* ed. Hellmut Ritter (Istanbul, 1928).

al-ʿAsqalānī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣābah fī tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* (Cairo: Būlāq, 1328/1910).

_____, *Lisān al-mīzān* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1987-1988).

_____, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb fī rijāl al-ḥadīth* (Beirut, 1968).

Ibn Aʿtham, *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, 8 vols. (Ḥaydarabād: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmānīyyah, 1968-75).

_____, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, *Kitāb al-Futūḥ*, Istanbul Manuscript, Library of Ahmet III.

Ibn al-Athīr, Izz al-Dīn, *al-Bāhir fī Tārīkh ad-Dawllah al-Tatabanya,* ed. A. Tulaymat (Cairo: 1962).

_____, *al-Kāmil fi al-taʾrīkh*, ed. C.J. Tornberg (Leiden: Brill, 1868-70).
_____, *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* (Beirut, 1965).

al-Baghdādī, Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir Ṭāhir, *Uṣūl al-dīn* (Istānbūl: Madrasat al-Ilāhīyāt bi-Dār al-Funūn al-Turkīyah, 1928), simplified translation in H.A.R. Gibb, “Constitutional

Organisation" in *Law in the Middle East*, ed. Majid Khadduri and Herbert J. Liebesny (Washington D.C., 1955).

al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (published for the first time by the School of Oriental Studies, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, SDF Goitein Univ Press, 1936).

_____, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, ed. Muḥammad Bāqir al-Maḥmūdī (Beirut, 1974).

_____, Aḥmed b. Yaḥyā, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf*, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979).

_____, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1996).

_____, *Futūḥ al-Buldān*, ed. M. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1865).

Al-Baqillānī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ṭayyib, *Manāqib al-aʾimmah al-arbaʿah,* ed. Samīra Farhat (Beirut: Dār al-Muntakhab al-ʿArabī, 2002).

_____, *al-Tamhīd fi al-Radd ʿalā al-mulḥidah al-muʿaṭṭalah wa al-rāfiḍah wa-l-Khawārij wa-l-Muʿtazilah* (al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Fikr al-Islāmī, 1947).

al-Dīnawarī, ʿbu ḥanīfah ʿāmad b. Dawūd, *al-Akhbār al-ṭiwāl* (Leiden: 1888).

al-Farazdaq, Hammām b. Ghālib Abū Firās, *Dīwān*, ed. M.I.A. al-Ṣāwī (Cairo, 1936 and Beirut, 1960).

Hajj Khalf, Mustafa b. Abdullah, *Kashf al-ẓunūn ʿan asāmī al-kutub wa-al-funūn,* ed. Gustav Flugel, 7 vols. (Leipzig and London: 1835-58).

al-Ḥamawī, Yāqūt b. ʿAbdallāh, *Irshād al-arīb ilā maʿrifat al-adīb*: *al-Muʿjam al-ʿUdaba* (Dictionary of Learned Men), ed. D.S. Margoliouth, 7 vols., 2nd edition (London: 1923-31).

Ibn Ḥanbal, ʿAbd Allāh b. Aḥmad, *Musnad* (Cairo: Maymanya Publishers, 1313 AH).

Ibn Hishām, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *Sīrat Sayyidna Muḥammad Rasūl Allāh*, ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld, 2 vols. (Göttingen, 1858-60; reprint, Frankfurt am Main, 1961).

al-Jāḥiẓ, Abū ʿUthmān ʿAmr b. Baḥr, *al-Bayān wa'l-tabyīn*, ed. A.S.M. Harun (Cairo, 1948-50).

_____, *Kitab al-hayawān*, ed, A.S.M. Harun, 2nd edition (Cairo: Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1965-1969).

_____, *Rasāʾil al-Jāḥiẓ*, ed. H. al-Sandubi (Cairo: Yuṭlab min al-Maktabah al-Tijārīyah al-Kubrā, 1933).

_____, *Rasa'il al-Jāḥiẓ*, ed. A.S.M. Harun (Cairo, 1965).

_____, *Risālat al-ʿUthmānīyya,* ed. A.S.M. Harun (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1955).

al-Jumaḥī, Muḥammad b. Sallām, *Ṭabaqāt fuḥūl al-shuʿarāʾ*, ed. A. M. Shakir (Cairo, 1952).

al-Juwayn□, □Abd al-Malik b. □Abd All□h b. Y□suf, *Ghiy□th al-Um□m fi al-Tiy□th al-□ulam*, ed. A. D□b (Qatar, 1400/1979).

Ibn Kath□r, Ism□□□l b. □Umar, *al-Bid□yah wa al-Nih□yah* (Beirut: Maktabah al-Ma□□rif, 1966).

_____, *al-Bid□ya wa-l-nih□ya*, ed. □Al□ □Abd al-□□□ir (Beirut: D□r al-Kutub al-□Ilmiyyah, 1985).
Ibn Khald□n, *Muqaddimah* (Cairo, 1321), quoted by L. Gardet and M.M. Anawati in *Introduction à La Théologie Musulmane* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1948).

Ibn Khallik□n, Shams al-D□n Ab□ al-□Abb□s A□mad b. Mu□ammad, *Wafay□t al-A'y□n*, (Cairo, 1948).

al-Kha□af□, Jar□r b. □A□□yya b., *Diw□n*, ed. M.I.A. al-Ṣ□w□ (Cairo 1353) and ed. N.M.A. Ṭ□h□ (Cairo 1969-70).

Ibn al-Khayy□□, □Abd al-Raḥīm b. Muḥammad, *Kit□b al-Inti□ar wa-al-radd □ala Ibn al-Rawand□ al-mul□id,* ed. and tr. Albert Nader (Beirut: al-Matba□ah al-Kathulikiyah, 1957).

_____, *al-□abaq□t: riw□yat Ab□ □Imr□n M□s□ al-Tustar□*, ed. Akram □iy□□ al-□Umar□ (Baghdad: Ma□ba□at al-□□n□, 1967).

_____, *T□r□kh Khal□fah b. Khayya□* (Beirut: D□r al-Kutub al-□Ilm□yyah, 1995).

al-Kind□, Ab□ □Umar Mu□ammad b. Y□suf, *Kit□b al-Wul□t wa Kit□b al-Qu□□t*, ed. R. Guest (Leiden, 1912).

al-Isfah□n□, Ab□ al-Faraj □Al□ b. al-□usayn, *Kit□b al-Agh□n□* (Cairo, 1285).

_____, *Kit□b al-Agh□n□*, ed. Na□r al-Hurin□, 20 vols. (Bul□q, 1868).

_____, *Kit□b al-Agh□n□* (Leiden, 1905).

_____, *Kit□b al-Agh□n□* (Cairo, 1927-74).

_____, *Maq□til al-□□lib□y□n*, ed. A□med Saqr (Cairo, 1949; 2nd edtn, Tehran, 1970).

_____, *Maqatil al-□□libiyy□n* (Najaf: al-Maktabah al-Ḥaydar□yah, 1965).

al-Isfah□ni, □asan Mu□ammad al-Raghib, *Kit□b al-mufrad□t f□ ghar□b al-Qur□□n* (Beirut: D□r al-ma□rifah, n.d.).

al-Jaṣṣāṣ, Aḥmad b. □Al□ al-R□z□, *Uṣ□l al-fiqh al-musamm□ bi al-Fuṣūl fī al-uṣ□l,* 4 vols., ed. U.J. Nashm□ (Kuwait: Wiz□rat al-Awq□f, 1994).

M□lik b. Anas, *Muwaṭṭa□ al-Im□m M□lik b. Anas (*Jeddah: D□r al-Shur□q, 1985).

Ibn Manẓ□r, Muḥammad b. Mukarram, *Lis□n al-□Arab*, 20 vols. (Cairo: B□laq, 1300-108 AH).

al-Maqr□z□, Ahmad b. □Al□, *al-Khi□a□,* ed. G. Wiet (Cairo, 1911-2).

al-Ma□r□, Im□m Jam□l al-D□n b. Man□□r, *Lis□n al-□Arab* (Beirut: D□r □□dir, 1955-56).

al-Mas□ □d□, □Al□ b. al-□usayn, *Mur□j al-Dhah□b wa Ma□□din al-Jawhar*, ed. C. Pellat (Beirut: Université Libanaise, 1966-79).

_____, *Les Prairies d'or,* ed and trans. Barbier de Maynard and Pavet de Courteille, 9 vols. (Paris, 1861-77).

_____, □Al□ b. al-□usayn, *al-Tanb□□ wa-l-ishr□f* (Leiden, 1894, rpt., Beirut: Maktabat al-Khayy□□, 1965).

al-Marzub□n□, Abī □Ubayd Allah Muḥammad b. □Imrān b. Mūs□, *al-Muwashshah* (Cairo, 1924).

al-M□ward□, Ab□ al-□asan □Al□ b. Mu□ammad b. □ab□b, *al-A□k□m al-Sul□□n□yyah* (Egypt, 1966).

al-Minq□r□, Na□r b. Muza□im, *Waq'at □iff□n,* ed. A.S.M. Har□n (Cairo, 1365 AH).

_____*,Waq□at □iff□n*, ed. A.S.M. Harun (Cairo, 1382 AH).

al-Mufa□□al b. Salamah, *F□kh□r*, ed. C.A. Storey (Leyden: Brill, 1915).

al-Muf□d, Ab□ Abdull□h Mu□ammad b. Mu□ammad, *Aw□□il al-maq□l□t fi'l-madh□hib al-mukht□r□t*, ed. □Abb□sq□l□ S. Wajd□, with notes and introduction by Faẓl All□h Zanj□n□, 2nd edition (Tabriz: Charandabi, 1371).

_____, *al-Fu□□l al-mukht□rah min al-□uy□n wa-al-*

ma□□sin (Tehran: Intish□r□t-i Nav□d, 1983).

_____, *al-Ifṣ□h fi Im□mat Am□r al-Mu□min□n □Al□ ibn Ab□ □alib*, 2nd edition (Najaf: al-Haidariyya, 1950).

_____, *Kit□b al-Irsh□d*, tr. I.K.A. Howard (London: The Muhammadi Trust, 1981).

_____, *Shar□ □aq□□id al-□ad□q* (Beirut: D□r al-Kit□b al-Isl□m□, 1983).

_____, *Taṣḥ□h al-i□tiq□d* (Qum, 1951).

Ibn al-Murta□□, Aḥmad b. Yaḥy□, *□abaq□t al-Mu□tazila/Die Klassen der Mu□taziliten von Ibn al-Murta□□*, ed. Sussana Diwald-Wilzer (Beirut: Imrimerie Catholique, 1961), as cited in L. Clarke, *Sh□□ite Heritage*.

al-Naj□sh□, Ab□ al-□Abbās Aḥmad b. □Al□, *Rij□l al-Naj□sh□* (Beirut: D□r al-Adw□', 1988).

al-N□s□b□r□, Muḥammad b. □Abd All□h al-□ak□m, *al-Mustadrak ala l-□a□□□ayn* (India: D□'irat al-Ma□□rif al-N□□imiyet al-Q□'ima f□ l-Hind, 1913).

al-N□mair□, Ab□ Zaid □Umar Ibn Shabba b. □Abida Zaid, *T□r□kh al-Mad□na al-Munawarrah*, ed. Fah□m Mu□ammad Shalt□t (Iran, 1989).

Nuwayr□, Aḥmad b. □Abd al-Wahh□b, *Nih□yat al-□Arab f□ fun□n al-Ad□b* (Cairo, 1342-48).

Al-Q□□□ al-Nu□m□n, Ab□ Ḥan□fa al-Nu□m□n b. Ab□ □Abdillah

Mu□ammad b. Manṣ□r al-Tam□m□, *Da□a□im al-Islam,* ed. A.A. Fyzee, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1951-60).

Q□sim b. Sall□m, Ab□ □Ubayd, *Kit□b al-amw□l* (al-Q□hirah: D□r al-Fikr, 1975).

al-Qurash□, Ya□y□ b. Adam, *Kit□b al-Khar□j*, ed. Th. W. Juynboll (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1896).

Ibn Qutayba, □Abdull□h b. Muslim, *al-Im□m□h wa'l-siy□sah* (Cairo, 1909).

_____, *Kit□b al-ma□arif*, ed. Tharwat □Uk□shah (Cairo: Ma□ba□at D□r al-Kutub, 1960).

Ibn Sa'd, Mu□ammad, *al-□abaq□t al-kubr□* (Beirut, 1947-60).

al-Ṣafad□, Khal□l b. Aybak, *al-W□f□ bi-al-wafay□t* (Beirut: D□r I□y□□ al-Tur□th al-□Arab□, 2000).

al-San□□n□, □Abd al-Razz□q b. □amm□m, *Muṣannaf*, ed. □ab□b al-Raḥm□n al-A□ẓam□, 11 vols. (Simlak, Dahbel/Beirut, 1391/1972).

Ibn Shahr□sh□b, Rash□d al-D□n Ab□ Ja□far Muḥammad b. □Al□, *Kit□b Ma□□lim al-□ulam□□* (Ṭehrān: Maṭba□at Fard□n, 1934).

al-Shamm□kh□, Ab□ al-□Abās Aḥmad b. Sa□□d, *Kit□b al-Siy□r* (Cairo, 1301).

al-Sh□r□z□, Ab□ Is□□q, *al-Ish□rah il□ madhhab Ahl al-□aqq* (al-Q□hirah: Markaz al-S□rah wa al-Sunnah, 1999).

al-Sijistān, Abū Yaqūb Isḥāq b. Aḥmad, *Kitāb al-Iftikhār,* ed. with notes and comments by Ismail K. Poonawala (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2000).

al-abarī, Abū Jafar Muammad b. Jarīr b.Yazīd, *Tārīkh al-Rusul wal-mulūk,* ed. M.J. de Goeje, et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1881).

_____, *Tārīkh al-Rusūl wal-Mulūk* (Cairo: al-Istiqāma Publishers, 1939).

_____, *Tārīkh al-rusul wa-al-mulūk,* ed. Muammad Abū al-Faīl Ibrāhīm, 11 vols. (Cairo: Dār al-Maārif, 1960-1970).

_____, *Tārīkh al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*, 13 vols. (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1998).

al-Tabrīzī, Yaīyā b. Alī Khaīb, *Sharḥ al-Ḥamāsah* (Cairo, 1916), vol. 1, 3.

al-Tamīmī, Sayf ibn Umar al-Asadī, *Kitāb al-Ridda waīl-futūh and Kitāb al-jamal wa-masīr āisha wa-Alī: A Facsimile Edition of the Fragments Preserved in the University Library of Imām Muammad Ibn Saūd Islamic University in Riyadh* (Leiden: Smitskamp Oriental Antiquarium, 1995).

al-Tawīdī, Abū ayyān Alī b. Muḥammad, *al-Baṣāir wa-al-dhakhāir*, ed. Wadīd al-Qā (Beirut, 1988).

_____, *Kitāb al-imtā wa-al-muānasah*, ed. Aīmed Amīn and Aīmed al-Zayn (Cairo, 1953).

_____, *Risālat al-Saqīfah,* published in I. al-Kīlānī, ed., *Thalāth rasā'il lī-Abī Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī* (Damascus, 1951).

Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqā, *al-Fakhrī fī al-adab al-sulṭānīyah wal duwal al-islāmīyya* (Cairo: al-Maktaba al-tijariya al-kubrā, 1927).

Ibn Ṭūlūn, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, *Quḍāt Dimashq: al-thaghr al-bassām fī dhikr man wuliyya qaḍāʾ al-Shām,* ed. S. Munajjid (Damascus, 1956).

al-Fihrist, ed. A. Sprenger/new ed. Maḥmud Ramyar (Mashhad, 1351).

Yaʿqūb, Abū Yūsuf, *Kitāb al-Kharāj* (1886).

al-Yaʿqūbī, Aḥmad b. Abī Yaʿqūb, *Kitāb al-Tārīkh* (Leiden: Brill, 1883).

_____, "Kitab al-Buldan" in Ibn Rustah's *Aʿlāq al-nafīsah,* ed. M.J. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1892).

al-Zubayrī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Muṣʿab b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Muṣʿab, *Nasab Quraysh* (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif lil-Ṭibāʿah wa-al-Nashr, 1953).

Secondary Sources

Abbott, N., *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

al-ʿAdawī, Ibrāhīm Aḥmad, *al-Dawla al-Umawīyah* (Cairo: Maktabat

al-Shab□b, 1987-88).

Afsaruddin, Asma, *Excellence and Precedence: Medieval Discourse on Legitimate Leadership* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

_____, *The First Muslims: History and Memory* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2008).

_____, "In Praise of the Caliphs: Recreating History from the *Man□qib* Literature", *IJMES,* 31 (1999).

Ahlwardt, W., *The Divans of the Six Ancient Arabic Poets*, 25, no. 23:11 (London, 1870).

□Al□, Jaw□d, "Mawarid *T□r□kh* al-□abar□", *Majallat al-Majma□ al-□Ilm□ al-Iraq□*, 1 (1950).

al-□Al□, □alih, "Muslim Estates in □ij□z in the First Century", *JESHO*, vol. 2 (1959).

□Al□, □Abdull□h Y□suf, tr. *The Qur□□n* (New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, Inc., 2007).

Allard, M., *Le Probleme des attributs divins dans la doctrine d'al-Ashari et de ses premiers grands disciples* (Beirut, 1965).

Aq□l, Nabil, *Dirasat fi al-□a□r al-umaw□,* 4th edition (Damascus: University of Damascus Press, 1991-92).

□Araf□t, W., "The Historical Background to the Elegies on □Uthm□n b. □Aff□n Attributed to □assan b. Thabit", *BSOAS*, 33 (1970).

Arberry, A. J., *Arabic Poetry: A Primer for Students* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1965).

Arnold, T. W., *The Caliphate* (New York : Barnes and Noble, 1966 [1924]).

al-ʿAskarī, S. M. *The Role of ʿĀʾisha in the History of Islam: ʿĀʾisha in the Time of Muʿāwiya b. Abī Sufyān,* tr. Dr. ʿAlī al-Dīn Pīzhūhī (Iran: Naba Organization, 2000).
Ashtiany, J. and J.D. Latham,*ʿAbbāsid Belles-Lettres* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

ʿAwwān, Ḥusayn, *Niẓām wilāyāt al-ʿahd wa wirāthāt al-khilāfah fī al-ʿasr al-Umawī* (Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1991).

ʿAzamī, M. M., *On Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies; 1996).

_____, *Studies in Early Ḥadith Literature* (Indianapolis: American Trust Publications, 1992).

al-Azmeh, A., *Muslim Kingship* (New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers, 1997).

Bahar, Muḥammad Taqī, ed., *Tārīkh-i Sīstān* (Tehran, 1314).

Bakhit, M. Adnan, and Robert Schick, eds., *The History of the Bilād al-Shām During the Umayyad Period*: *Fourth International Conference of the History of Bilād al-Shām* (Amman: University of Jordan and Yarmouk University, 1989).

Bakhtin, M. M., *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin: Univeristy of Texas Press, 1981).

Barthes, Roland, *The Pleasure of the Text* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1975).

Bashear, Suliman, “The Title F□r□q and its Association with □Umar I”, *Studia Islamica*, 72 (1990).

Bates, Michael, “The □Arab-Byzantine Bronze Coinage of Syria: An Innovation by □Abd al-M□lik”, *A Colloquium in Memory of George Carpenter Miles* (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1976).

Bayhom-Daou, T., “The Im□m's Knowledge and the Qur□□n According to al-Fa□l b. Sh□dh□n al-N□s□b□r□ (d. 260 A.H./874 A.D.)”, *BSOAS*, 64, 2 (2001).

_____, *Shaykh Muf□d: Makers of the Muslim World* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005).

Berg, H., *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2000).

Birkeland, H., *Old Muslim Opposition Against Interpretation of the Qur□□n* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1955).

Brock, Sebastian P., “Syriac Sources for Seventh Century History”, *BMGS*, 2 (1976).

_____, “Syriac Views of Emergent Islam’ in G.H.A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies in the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1982).

Brockelmann, C., “al-Ya’kubī”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition (Leiden: Brill, 1954-66).

Brown, J., *Ḥadīth*: *Muhammad’s Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2009).

Burton, J., *An Introduction to the Ḥadīth* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994).

Busse, H., “Monotheismus und Islamische Christologie in der Bauinschrift des Felsendoms in Jerusalem’’, *Theologische Quartalschrift,* 161 (1981) as cited by Donner in *Narratives of Islamic Origins*.

Cahen, C., “History and Historians: From the Beginnings to the Time of al-Ṭabarī”, *Religion, Learning and Science in the ‘Abbāsid Period: The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Calder, Norman, “The Qurrā and the Arab Lexicographical Tradition”, *JSS*, 36, 2 (1991).

Cameron, A. J., *Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī: An Examination of His Image in the Hagiography of Islam*, Oriental Translation Fund, New Series, vol. 63 (London: Luzac and Co. Ltd. for the Royal Asiatic Society, 1973).

Cameron, Averil, “Images of Authority: Elites and Icons in Late Sixth-Century Byzantium”, in M. Mullet and R. Scott (eds.), *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1981).

el-Cheikh, N., *Byzantium Viewed by the Arabs* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Centre for Middle-Eastern Studies, 2004).

Cooperson, M., *Classical Arabic Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Crone, Patricia, *God's Rule: Government in Islam* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

_____, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2004).

_____, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

_____, "Were the Qays and Yemen of the Umayyad Period Political Parties?" *DI*, 71 (1994).

Crone, Patricia, and M. Cook, *Hagarism: The Making Of The Islamic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

Crone, Patricia, and F.W. Zimmerman, *The Epistle of S□lim b. Dhakw□n* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Coulson, N.J., *A History of Islamic Law*, *Islamic Surveys,* vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1964; reprint, 1991).

Culler, Jonathan, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981).

Dabashi, Hamid, *Authority in Islam: From the Rise of Muhammad to the Establishment of the Umayyads,* 2nd edition (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1992).

Dakake, Maria, *The Charismatic Community: Sh□'ite Identity in Early Islam* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2007).

al-D□b, □Abd al-□Aẓ□m, *Im□m al-□□ramayn* (Kuwait: D□r al-Qalam, 1981).

Dixon, A. A., *The Umayyad Caliphate 65-86/684-705: A Political Study* (London: Luzac, 1971).

Donner, Fred, *The Early Islamic Conquests* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

_____, "From Believers to Muslims: Confessional Self-Identity in the Early Islamic Community'' in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, IV: Patterns of Communal Identity,* ed. Lawrence I. Conrad (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2003).

_____, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginning of Islamic Historical Writing* (Princeton: The Darwin Press, Inc: 1998).

D□r□, A. A., *The Rise of History Among the Arabs* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).

Elad, A., "The Beginnings of Historical Writing by the Arabs: The Earliest Syrian Writers on the Arab Conquests", *JSAI*, 28 (2003).

Ennami, A. K., “A Description of New ʿIbāḍī Manuscripts from North Africa”, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 15 (1970).

Farouq, Umar, *Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ Muʾarrikhān* (Baghdād: 1967).

Faris, N. A., “Development in Arab Historiography as Reflected in the Struggle Between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah” in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. P. M. Holt and B. Lewis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

Flood, Gavin, *Beyond Phenomenology*: *Rethinking the Study of Religion* (London: Cassell, 1999).

Fowden, G., *Quṣayr ʿAmra: Art and the Umayyad Elite in Late Antique Syria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1st Edition, 2004).

Fück, Johann, “Die Rolle des Traditionalismus im Islam’’, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft,* 93 (1939) in Berg, H., *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam*, (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2000).

Fyzee, A. A., “Qāḍī an-Nuʿmān: The Fāṭimid Jurist and Author”, *JRAS* (1934).

Geyer, R., *The Divan of al-Ḫāṭiʾisha* (London, E.J.W. Gibb Memorial series, N.S.6, 1928).

Gleave, R. “Between Ḥadīth and Fiqh: Early Imāmī Collections of Akhbār”, *ILS*, 8, 3 (2001).

Goldziher, I., *Mohamedanische Studien* (first published 1890), vol. 2, tr. into English by C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern under the title *Muslim Studies*, vol. 2 (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967-71).

_____, *The Principles of Law in Islam*, vol. 8, 301, in *The Historian's History of the World,* ed. H.S. Williams (London, 1907).

Goriawala, M., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Fyzee collection of Ismaili Manuscripts,* no. 24 and no. 49 entitled *Ithbāt al-Imāmah* (Bombay: University of Bombay, 1965).

Gorke, A., "The Historical Tradition about al-Hudaybīyya", in *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources*, ed. Harald Motzki (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

Gruendler, B., "Verse and Taxes: The Function of Poetry in Selected Literary *Akhbār* of the Third/Ninth Century" in *On Fiction and Adab in Medieval Arabic Literature*, ed. Ph. F. Kennedy (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005).

Gunther, S., "Assessing the Sources of Classical Arabic Compilations: The Issue of Categories and Methodologies", *BJMES*, 32, 1 (2005).

Halm, Heinz, *Shī'ism* (Edinburgh, 1992).

Hamda, Muḥammad Māhir, *Dirāsa wathā'iqīyya li-l-Tārīkh al-Islamī wa-maṣādirihī; min ʿahd banī umayyah ḥata al-fatḥ al-ʿUthmānī li-Sūriyah wa-Miṣr 40-922 AH /661-1516 CE* (Beirut: Mu'assassat al Risāla, 1988).

Hasson, Isaac, ‘La conversion de Mu□□wiya ibn Ab□ Sufy□n’, *JSAI*, 22 (1998).

Hawting, Gerald R., *The First Dynasty of Islam* (London: Routledge, 2000).

_____, “The Origins of the Muslim Sanctuary at Mecca”, in G.H.A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1982).

_____, “The Significance of the Slogan *La □ukma illa Lillah* and the References to the *□ud□d* in the Traditions about the *Fitna* and the Murder of □Uthm□n”, *BSOAS,* 41 (1978).

el-□ibr□, T., *JSTOR*, vol. 118, n.1.

_____, *Reinterpreting Islamic Historiography: Har□n al-Rash□d and the Narrative of the ‘Abb□sid Caliphate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Hinds, Martin, “The Banners and the Battle Cries of the Arabs at the Battle of □iff□n (657 AD)”, *al-Ab□□th*, 24 (1971).

_____, “Mu□□wiya I”, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

_____, “The Murder of the Caliph □Uthm□n”, *IJMES*, 3 (1972).

_____, “Sayf b. □Umar’s Sources on Arabia”, *Studies in the History of Arabia*, 1: ii (1979).

_____, “The Siffin Arbitration Agreement”, *JSS,* 17 (1972).

Hitti, Philip K., *History of the Arabs* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

Hodgson, Marshall, “How Did the Early Shi’a become Sectarian”, *JAOS*, 75 (1955).

Horst, Heribert, *Die Gewahrsmanner im korankommentar at-□abar□: Ein Beitrag zur kenntnis der exegetischen Uberlieferung im Islam* (Rheinische Friedrich-Willhelms-Universitat zu Bonn, Ph.D dissertation, 1951) in Berg, H., *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2000).

Hoyland, R., “Sebeos, the Jews and the Rise of Islam”, *SMJR,* 2 (1996).

_____, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1997), quoting George of Resh’aina, “An Early Syriac Life of Maximus XXIII”.

Humphreys, R. S., *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

_____, *Mu□□wiya ibn Ab□ Sufy□n: From Arabia to Empire* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2006).

Ibr□h□m, Ma□mood, *Merchant Capital and Islam* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1990).

_____, *The Social and Economic Background of the*

Umayyad Caliphate (University of California, Los Angeles, Ph.d. dissertation, 1981).

Ivanow, V., "Early Sh□'ite Movements", *JBBRAS* (1941).

Izutsu, T., *Ethico-Religious Concepts in the Qur□□n* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1966).

_____, *God and Man in the Koran: Semantics of the Qur□□nic Weltanschauung* (Tokyo: The Keio Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies, 1964).

al-Jabbur□, K. S., *Nuṣ□s min T□r□kh Abī Mikhnaf Lūṭ b. Yaḥy□ b. Sa'□d al-J□mid□ al-Azd□ l-K□f□ l-Mutawaffa* [157 H] (Beirut: D□r al-Ras□l al-Akram, 1999).

Jones, J.M.B., "The Chronology of the *Magh□z□*: A Textual Survey", *BSOAS*, XIX (1957).

Juynboll, G.H.A., *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and the Authorship of Early □ad□th* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

_____, *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982).

Kaegi, Walter, "Initial Byzantine Reactions to the Arab Conquests", *CH,* 38 (1969).

Kassis, H. E., *A Concordance of the Qur□□n* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1983).

Kennedy, Hugh, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphate: The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century* (London: Longman, 1986).

_____, *Al-□abar□: Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam* (London: Darwin Press, 2008).

Keshk, Khaled, *The Depiction of Mu□□wiya in the Early Islamic Sources* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2002).

_____, *The Historian's Mu□□wiyah: The Depiction of Mu□□wiyah in the Early Islamic Sources* (Saarbrucken: VDM Verlag Dr Muller, 2008).

_____, "The Historiography of an Execution: The Killing of □ujr ibn □Adi", *Journal of Islamic Studies* 19, 1 (January 2008).

Kh□lid□, T., *Arab Historical Thought in the Classical Period* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

_____, *Images of Muhammad* (New York: Doubleday, 2009).

Kohlberg, Etan, "Evolution of the Sh□□a'', *JQ,* 27 (1983).

_____, "From Im□m□yya to Ithn□-Ashar□yya'', *BSOAS*, 39 (1976).

_____, "Im□m and Community in the Pre-Ghayba Period", in *Authority and Political Culture in Sh□'ism*, ed.

Sa’□d Am□r Arjomand (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988).

_____, “The Term *Muhaddath in Twelver* Sh□’ism”, *Studio Orientalia D.H. Baneth Dedicata* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1979).

Kristeva, Julia, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980).

Lalani, Arzina, *Early Sh□□□ Thought: The Teachings of Im□m Mu□ammad al-B□qir* (London: I.B. Tauris and the Institute of □Ism□□il□ Studies, 2004).

Lambton, A., *State and Government in Medieval Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).

Lammens, Henri, *Etudies sur le regne du Calife Omiyade Mo’awiya I* (Leipzig, 1908).

_____, “Mu’□wiya”, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam,* 2nd edition (Leiden: Brill, 1954-66).

Lapidus, Ira M., *A History of Islamic Societies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

_____, “Knowledge, Virtue, and Action: The Classical Muslim Conception of *Adab* and the Nature of Religious Fulfillment in Islam” in *Moral Conduct and Authority: The Place of Adab in South Asian Islam*, ed. Barbara D. Metcalf (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

_____, 'The Separation of State and Religion in the Development of Early Islamic Society", *IJMES* 6 (1975).

Lassner, J., *Islamic Revolution and Historical Memory* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1986).

Lecker, Michael, "The Estates of □Amr b. al-□□ in Palestine: Notes on a New Negev Arabic Inscription", *BSOAS*, 52 (1989).

Leder, Stefan, "The Literary Use of the *Khabar*: A Basic Form of Historical Writing" in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East I: Problems in the Literary Source Material*, ed. Averil Cameron and Lawrence I. Conrad (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1992).

Lewinstein, K., *Journal of the American Oriental Society,* 121, 2 (2001).

Lindsay, J., *Ibn As□k□r and Early Islamic History* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 2001).

Macdonald, D. B., *Development of Muslim Theology: Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903).

MacIntyre, Alasdair, *A History of Ethics* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967).

McCarthy, R. J., "Al-B□qill□n□", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition (Leiden: Brill, 1954-66).

_____, *The Theology of al-Ash□□r□* (Beirut: 1953).

McCutcheon, Russell T., “General Introduction” in *The Insider/Outsider Problem in the Study of Religion*, ed. Russell T. McCutcheon (London: Cassell, 1999).

McDermott, Martin J., *The Theology of Shaykh al-Mufīd* (Beirut, 1978).

Madelung, Wilferd, *The Succession to Muḥammad* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Madelung, Wilferd, “Early Sunnī Doctrine Concerning Faith as Reflected in the Kitāb al-Imān of Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām” (d. 224/839), *SI,* 32 (1970).

_____, “The Hāshimīyāt of al-Kumayt and Hāshimī Shīʿism”, *SI*, 70 (1989).

Margoliouth, D. S., *Lectures on Arab Historians* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1930).

Marsham, Andrew, *Rituals of Islamic Monarchy, Accession and Succession in the First Muslim Empire* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009).

Martensson, U., “Discourse and Historical Analysis: The Case of al-Ṭabarī’s History of the Messengers and the Kings”, 16 (2005).

Mattson, I., *JR,* 78, 2 (1998).

Miles, G. C., ‘Early Islamic Inscriptions Near ʿAqaba, Petra and the Wādī Rum’, *JNES,* 7 (1948).

Millward, W. G., “Al-Yaʿqūbī’s Sources and the Question of Shīʿī

Partiality", *Abr Nahrain*, 12 (1971-1972).

Modarressi, Hossein, *Crisis and Consolidation in the Formative Period of Sh□□ite Islam: Ab□ Ja□far ibn Qiba al-R□z□ and His Contribution to Im□mite Sh□'ite Thought* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1993).

_____, *Tradition and Survival: A Bibliographical Survey of Early Sh□'ite Literature* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2003).

Montgomery, J., "al-J□□i□" in *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, vol. 311: *Arabic Literary Heritage 500-925, ed.* S.M. Toorawa and M. Cooperson (Detroit: Layman, Brucoli & Clark, 2005).

_____, "J□□i□□s *Kit□b al-Bayan wa-l-Tabayin"*, in Julia Bray (ed.), *Writing and Representation: (London: Muslim Horizons,* 2006).

_____, "Of Models and Amanuenses: The Remarks on the Qaṣ□da in Ibn Qutaybah's *Kit□b al-Shi'r wa-l-Shu'ar□*", in R. Hoyland and P. Kennedy (ed.), *Islamic Reflections, Arabic Musings: Studies in Honour of Alan Jones (*Oxford: Gibb Memorial Trust, 2004).

Morony, M., trans., *History of T□bar□: Between Civil Wars: The Caliphate of Mu'□wiyah*, vol. 18 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987).

_____, *Iraq after the Muslim Conquest* (Princeton: N.J.; Princeton University Press, 1984).

_____, *NES*, 59, 2 (2000).

Motzki, H., *The Biography of Muhammad: The Issue of the Sources* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

_____, *ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004).

_____, 'The *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Ḥammām al-Sanʿānī as a Source of Authentic *Aḥādīth* of the First Century AH', *JNES*, 50 (1991).

Mubarak, Z., *al-Nathr al-Fannī* (Cairo, 1934).

Muir, W. *The Caliphate: Its Rise, Decline and Fall* (London: Religious Tract Society, 1891).

al-Najjar, M., *al-Dawla al-Umawīyya fi al-sharq* (Cairo, 1962).

Nallino, C. A., "Appunti sulla natura del 'Califatto' in genere e sul presunto 'Califatto ottomano'", in *Raccolta di scritti editi e inediti* (Rome, 1941) as cited in Watt, W. Montgomery,"God's Caliph: Qurʾānic Interpretations and Umayyad Claims", *Iran and Islam*, ed. C. E. Bosworth (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971).

Noth, A., and L. Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source-Critical Study* (Princeton: Darwin Press, 1994).

Ostrogorsky, George, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968).

Palmer, A., S. Brock, and R. Hoyland, *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1993).

Pellat, C., *The Life and Works of J□□i□: Translation of Selected Texts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).

Petersen, E., "□Al□ and Mu'□wiya: The Rise of the Ummayad Caliphate 656-661", *Acta Orientalia*, 23 (1955).

_____, □*Al□ and Mu□□wiya* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1964).

Poonawala, Ismail K., *Al-Qa□□ al-Num□n and his Urjuza on the Im□mate* (University of California, Los Angeles, Ph.d. dissertation, 1970).

al-Q□□□, Wad□d, *Bishr ibn Kubar al-Balaw□*; *Nam□dhaj min al-nathr al-fann□ al-mubakkir f□ al-Yaman* (Beirut: D□r al-Gharb al-Islam□, 1985).

_____, "al-Raka'i□ al-fikr□yyah f□ na□rat Ab□ □ayy□n al-Taw□□d□ il□ l-mujtama", *al-Ab□□th*, 23 (1970).

_____, "The Religious Foundation of Late Umayyad Ideology and Practice'', *Saber Religioso y Poder Politico en el Islam: Actas del Simposio Internacional,* Granada, 15-18 octubre 1991 (Madrid, 1994).

_____, "The Term 'Khal□fa' in Early Exegetical Literature", *DWI,* 28 (1988).

Qu□b, Sayyid, *Social Justice in Islam,* tr. John Hardie (New York: Octagon Books, 1970).

Qu□buddin, T., "*Khu□ba*: The Evolution of Early Arabic Oration", in *Classical Arabic Humanities in their Own Terms: Festschrift for Wolfhart Heinrichs on his 65th Birthday*, ed. Beatrice Gruendler (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2008).

Reinink, G.J., "The Beginnings of Syriac Apologetic Literature in Response to Islam", *Oriens Christianus,* 77 (1993).

Richards, D. S., "Ibn al-Ath□r and the Later Parts of the *K□mil*: A Study for Aims and Methods" in *Medieval Historical Writing in the Christian and Islamic Worlds*, ed. D.O. Morgan (London: SOAS, University of London, 1982).

Rippin, A., "Literary Analysis of the Qur□□n, *Tafs□r* and *S□rah*: The Methodologies of John Wansborough'' in *Approaches to Islam in Religious Studies*, ed. Richard C. Martin (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1985).

Robinson, C., □*Abd al-M□lik: Makers of the Muslim World* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2007).

_____, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Robson, J., "The *Isn□d* in Muslim Tradition'', *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society,* 15 (1953-4).

Rosenthal, F. A., *Knowledge Trimuphant : The Concept of Knowledge in Medieval Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

_____, *History of Muslim Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1968).

_____, *The History of ṭabarī* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989).

Rubin, Uri, "The Eye of the Beholder: The Life of Muhammad As Viewed By the Early Muslims, A Textual Analysis", *Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam*, 8 (Princeton: The Darwin Press, 1995).

al-Ṣ□marr□□□, Ibrah□m, *F□ al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Isl□m□* (Beirut: D□r al-Had□thah, 1990).

Schoeler, G., *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam,* tr. Uwe Vagelpohl (London: Routledge, 2006).

Serjeant, R. B., "The Caliph □Umar's Letters to Ab□ Mus□ and Mu□□wiya", *SS*, 24 (1984).

Sezg□n, F., *Geschichte des Arabesque Schriftums*, *Band I: Qur□□n Wissenschaften, □adith, Geschichte, F□qh, Dogmatik, Mystik bis ca. 430 H,* tr. H. Berg (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967).

Sezgin, U., *Ab□ Mikhnaf: Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie des umaiyadischen Ziet* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) as cited in C. Robinson.

Shaban, M. A., *The Abbasid Revolution* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

_____, *Islamic History: A New Interpretation A.D. 600-750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

Shahid, Irfan, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Fifth Century* (Washington D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Research Library Collection, 1989).

_____, *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century* (Washington D.C. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library Collection, 1995).

_____, *Byzantium and the Arabs in Late Antiquity* (Bruxelles: Byzantion, 2005).

Sharon, Moshe, "Notes on the Question of Legitimacy of Government in Islam", *IAO*, 10 (1980).

_____, "The Umayyads as Ahl al-Bayt", *JSAI*, 14 (1992).

Shepard, W., "The Development of the Thought of Sayyid Qu□b as Reflected in Earlier and Later Editions of 'Social Justice in Islam"', *DWI,* 32 (1992).

_____, "Sayyed Qu□b's Doctrine of Ja□il□yya", *IJMES*, 35 (2003).

Schacht, J., *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950).

Shackle, Christopher, and Stefan Speri, "Qaṣ□da Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa", 2 vols., in *Studies in Arabic Literature*, vol. 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

Silverstein, A., *Postal-Systems in the Pre-Modern Islamic World: Cambridge Studies in Islamic Civilization* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Speight, M., "A Look at Variant Readings in the *□□d□th*", *DI*, 77 (2000).

Stetkevych, Jaroslav, *Arabic Poetry and Orientalism* (Oxford: St John's College Research Centre, 2004).

Stetkevych, S., *Early Islamic Poetry and Poetics: The Formation of the Classical Islamic World* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Variorum, 2009).

_____, *The Mute Immortals Speak: Pre-Islamic Poetry and the Poetics of Ritual* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993).

Stewart, Devin, "*Saj'* in the Qur'an: Prosody and Structure", *JAL,* 21 (1990).

Stroumsa, S., "The Blinding Emerald: Ibn al-Rawand□'s *Kitab al-Zumurrud*", *JAOS,* 114 (1994).

_____, "Ibn al-Rawand□'s *Su□ adab al-mujadala*: The Role of Bad Manners in Medieval Disputations" in H. Lazarus-Yaffe, et al. (eds.), *The Majlis: Interreligious Encounters in Medieval Islam, Studies in Arabic Language and Literature* (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 1999).

Taqqush, M. S., *T□r□kh al-dawla al-Umaw□yya* (Beirut: D□r al-Naf□□is, 1996).

Thompson, Willie, *Postmodernism and History* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Tyan, E., *Histoire de l'organisation judiciare en pays d'Islam* (Paris, 1938-1943; 2nd edition, Leiden, 1960) in Watt, W. Montgomery,"God's Caliph: Qur□□nic Interpretations and Umayyad Claims", *Iran and Islam*, ed. C.E. Bosworth (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971).

□Uways, Abd al-□al□m, *Ban□ Umayyah bayn al-suq□t wa al-inti□□r; dir□sah □awl suq□□ Ban□ Umayyah f□ al-mashriq* (Cairo: D□r al-Sahwa, 1987).

al-Wak□l, Mu□ammad al-Sayyid, *al-Umaw□yun bayna al-sharq wal-gharb: dir□sah wa□f□yah wa-ta□l□l□yah lil-dawlah al-Umaw□yah* (Damascus: D□r al-Qalam, 1995).

Walmand, M. R., *Toward a Theory of Historical Narrative* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1980).

Watt, W. Montgomery, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1973).

_____,"God's Caliph: Qur□□nic Interpretations and Umayyad Claims", *Iran and Islam*, ed. C.E. Bosworth (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1971).

_____, *Mu□ammad at Mecca* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953).

_____, "Sh□'ism under the Umayyads", *JRAS* (1960).

Wansborough, J., *Qur□□nic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).

Weber, Max, *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers*, ed. S.N. Eisenstadt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

Wellhausen, J., *The Arab Kingdom and its Fall*, tr. Margaret Weir (Beirut: Khayats, 1963).

_____, *The Religio-Political Factions of Early Islam*, ed. R.C. Ostle, trans. R.C. Ostle and S.M. Waltzer (Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing, 1975).

White, Hayden, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973).

Wolfson, H., *The Philosophy of the Kalam* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976).